

THE  
**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**  
OR  
**Evangelical Repository.**

NO. 4.

SEPTEMBER, 1828.

VOL. V.

**Original Communications.**

[The following article "*on oaths*," first appeared in our June number for 1826, previous to the abduction of William Morgan ; but several of our readers, who did not then take the work, having heard of it, have requested its insertion again. We accordingly gave the writer notice of this request, and he has added the introduction and notes.]

MR. EDITOR—

You state that it is requested by a considerable number of your readers, especially in the west, that the paper on oaths in your third volume have a place in your pages again. Although I have an aversion to repetition, and am not altogether sure whether in this instance it may not be offensive to some of your readers, yet if it shall contribute any thing towards the confirmation of Secession principles, respecting oaths, or towards the downfall of that wicked system, *Free Masonry*, I will cheerfully accede.

As the Morgan outrage has been committed, and the veil of secrecy drawn aside from Masonry, at least to a great extent, since the paper in request was written, your readers will now have an opportunity of judging whether your correspondent G. misrepresented that system, as much as its votaries have repeatedly said, or not. If I have judged correctly, in the case, recent disclosures have proved, that "*its may bees*," are matters of fact, and that not one of its statements can be justly charged with misrepresentation, unless, it be in this, that none or all of them together give the reader an idea of half the baseness of masonry, and the mischief with which it is pregnant. We can no longer be told that we do not know what masonry is, except by a bigotry and infatuation that has become desperate, because the concealment of its hedious deformity is no longer possible. I refuse to admit the testimony of those who still adhere to the order, because they stand suspected of having a concern in a series of the most daring outrages, ever committed

in a civilized country ; because the style in which they speak about these outrages, whether real or supposed, does in no degree indicate the seriousness of honesty, but is plainly the most insulting mockery to the tenderest feelings of humanity ; and because, the accounts which they have offered to their highly incensed countrymen, respecting the fate and situation of Morgan, are contradictory and absurd. On the other hand, we have the concurring testimony of a large number of men who have been initiated into the high mysteries of the order, and whose veracity and respectability stand unimpeached, except by interested masons. The latter, charge them with perjury, and, therefore, insist that they are not entitled to credit ; but masons ought to be aware that this very charge necessarily implies that these men have told us what masonry *really is*, and that hereby they have indirectly given strength to their testimony. The breaking of such heaven-daring oaths and obligations as have now been disclosed to the world, was the strongest indication which men in their circumstances could give of a love to truth, as well as to justice, and they are therefore entitled to more credit instead of less. Moreover, these men to whom we are indebted for a disclosure of masonry, and its monstrous blasphemies, and horrible wickedness, knew before, that, they would have, in making that disclosure, to encounter the wrath and indignation of the whole fraternity ; and that reputation, property, and life must be put to hazard. That that wrath and indignation has manifested itself against them, the whole world knows. Is it likely then that men of their known probity would run such a hazard in order to tell so many lies ? If after all, they have told only lies, what cause had masons to make all this ado ? their mysteries are still all safe. If they told lies, they have only drawn a thicker veil over the sacred mysteries of the ancient and venerable fraternity, and turned aside the daring curiosity of the uninitiated to something which is *not* masonry. Why then go on at this rate, in kidnapping, and slander, burning, and murder ? But is not the truth too plain to be denied, that "their gods are taken away, and what have they more." In a word, it is most unlikely, that men of different characters, religious persuasions, political opinions, men in different and distant places and strangers to one another, should all combine, without discovery, to palm a lie upon the world. Therefore, I repeat it, we now know *what masonry is*. Hitherto the Associate church has condemned the swearing of the mason's oath, only because it was swearing to keep secret and to do what was not made known till after the oath is taken. But will she not now be obliged, as a faithful witness, to say something more particular ? It is not one oath, but a multitude of oaths. Their penalties are shocking and sinful. The obligations themselves are sinful. So much of them as has come to light, plainly elevates the system of masonry above every thing

that is valuable to man, in a political, civil, moral, or religious view. Is all this to be overlooked, and are we to commune with the secret friends of this horrible system upon their acknowledging simply that it was sinful to swear an oath, before knowing its import, and promising to refrain from lodge meetings? In consistency with our witnessing character we cannot.

FOR THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

### ON OATHS.

MR. EDITOR—

Your Repository promises to be devoted to the defence of the principles of the Reformation set forth in the Westminster Confession, and by the churches in Holland. It appears to me that in order to redeem this pledge, you must sometime or other turn your attention to what that Confession says about the taking of an oath. It says "A lawful oath is a part of religious worship, wherein upon just occasion, the person swearing, solemnly calleth God to witness what he asserteth or promiseth; and to judge him according to the truth or falsehood of what he sweareth. The name of God only, is that by which men ought to swear; and therein it is to be used with all holy fear and reverence. Therefore to swear vainly or rashly by that glorious and dreadful name; or to swear at all by any other thing is sinful and to be abhorred. Yet in matters of weight and moment, an oath is warranted by the word of God, under the New Testament as well as under the Old; so a lawful oath imposed by lawful authority is to be taken. Whosoever taketh an oath, ought duly to consider the weightiness of so solemn an act, and therein to avouch nothing but what he is fully persuaded is the truth. Neither may any man bind himself by oath to any thing, but what is good and just, and what he believeth so to be, and what he is able and resolved to perform," &c. chap. 22. All this is so agreeable to the texts of scripture adduced as proof, that it must be extremely difficult to offer even a plausible objection to it.

And I believe very few if any of your readers will hesitate to subscribe the doctrine as perfectly consonant with scripture. But something more than a correct judgment is required; for if a man does not respect the doctrine in his practice, the end of it is as completely lost as if he honestly denied it, and the effect produced by his example is much worse than if he did so. It surely concerns all who have professed an adherence to that Confession, to enquire whether this portion of the Reformation principles is keeping its ground in the present day or not. And they ought especially to enquire, (if they have any value for consistency, and wish to be found faithful before God as soldiers of Jesus Christ, witnesses for injured truth, or friends

to man,) whether all the instances of their own swearing harmonize with this doctrine or not.

An oath is a very solemn thing. It is so accounted by all civilized nations as well as professing Christians. It lies at the foundation of all morality, social order, and the fear of God. Whatever a man's speculative views on the subject be, if he *feel* habitually indifferent about the nature of an oath, he is one of those who fear not God, nor regard man. It will be readily granted that swearing in common conversation is directly contrary to the doctrine above stated, and a great wickedness; but very few have the least suspicion that they themselves are guilty. The *very disposition* in the mind to frame an oath, though it should not be expressed in words is wickedness of the same nature. He that said "whoso looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her in his heart," would pronounce it to be the swearing of the heart. Much more all those expressions evidently used instead of an oath, which are very common among professors, and even among some who pass for ministers of the gospel. If any of your readers allow themselves in such expressions as "bless me—my goodness—dear help me—good heavens—mercy on me—hang—blast—sink, &c. they ought to know that in God's sight at least they are guilty of swearing vainly, rashly, and without any proper occasion or lawful authority. This kind of expression is grossly inconsistent with their profession, and criminal in the sight of God. It cannot fail to harden the wicked and profane who hear it;—to sear their own conscience (so far as its influence goes) and be very grievous to the godly. It may also cause the weak to stumble, and fall into the very same offence. Each of these effects and consequences ought to be exceedingly dreaded by every professed follower of the Lamb. If any true child of God be guilty in this respect, he has good reason to expect that the Father will some day lift up a chastening hand on account of it and cause him to smart for his iniquity. He will not then be disposed to consider it a small sin.

It is truly affecting to observe with how little consideration an oath seems to be administered and received in courts, custom houses, &c. It occurs so often that the solemnity of it wears off. It is looked upon as a matter of course. The mind loses sight of its importance and its end, and in process of time the conscience of many a man becomes insensible to the obligation of it, and he is prepared to swear to any thing.—Others who do not give way so far to the influence of circumstances, have nevertheless their moral sensibility blunted, and they forget that they are offering, or professing to offer up to the Supreme Being, a tribute of worship. And such indifference will not long continue alone but will produce a train of effects upon the mind all unfavourable to holiness.



When a professor of religion enters into an office, having the administering or receiving of oaths as a part of its duties, he ought well to consider this matter, and whether or not he is able to resist the temptation. After he is in office, he ought frequently to use means to impress his mind with the solemnity of an oath. Witnesses and jurors would do well to read over the above chapter of the Confession as often as they are called to take an oath.

Is it not also a matter deserving serious consideration, that some magistrates who profess belief in the said Confession, and lift up a testimony in its defence, without seeming to have any scruple, administer oaths in the superstitious way of kissing the gospels, which have frequently a cross upon them? There is surely an inconsistency between profession and practice in this particular which cannot easily be got over by a tender conscience. Surely they do not mean to assent to the superstitious opinions of popery and others allied to it; and yet, it would be difficult for an intelligent spectator to conceive, that the magistrate and the individual swearing, have not fellowship together even in the *manner of it*. And I cannot help viewing the magistrate in this instance as practically renouncing Reformation principles so far as concerned in the manner of an oath. Such inconsistency cannot be viewed as a light matter. A magistrate is looked up to as a pattern, and so his authority, and the weight of his example is given to a practice in the whole district, which subverts the cause of the Reformation, so far as it goes. If he acts differently sometimes, that only proves that he considers it a matter of indifference, which is still worse.

There is a species of swearing which seems to be growing daily more popular in the United States, which deserves serious attention, viz. the swearing of what is called the Mason oath. Men of the highest rank and influence, who are respected as examples of good order, as friends to their country, and as Christians; and it is reported that even some ministers of the gospel, take that oath. Their high standing will, in the estimation of many, supercede all enquiry and sanction its propriety; it will be a strong temptation to others, though not fully satisfied to fall in with them; and it will create difficulties to those who wish to be consistent.

There are numbers of professors who have inconsiderately gone into it, and their conduct would seem to say, that there is nothing in it contrary to the Confession of Faith; and they would probably be highly offended were they to be spoken to on the subject; but that, Sir, need not prevent me from speaking the truth in your ear, nor you from listening to it.

First, Sir, I would ask whether the occasion on which this oath is taken, be what the Confession calls a *just occasion*? It

is not on the occasion of any duty commanded in the moral law. Nor do I apprehend that the fraternity will plead this. Nor on the occasion of any duty inculcated in the Old or New Testaments. We are indeed told that the principles of Masonry are taken out of the Bible; but though that were unquestionably correct, it would not follow that the Bible enjoined it on us to become Free Masons. It is not on the occasion of any duty required by our country. It is not the oath of allegiance to the government required on entering into the army: neither is it the oath required when one becomes a citizen. It is not required on entering into any office in the nation, nor is it required of jurymen or witnesses, nor of any one whatsoever by the authority of the State, as qualifying for duty, or entitling to privilege; the constitution knows nothing of it at all. I conclude therefore, that it is not on the occasion of any duty we can owe to the civil constitution.

Sometimes a man is called on to swear when his property or character is at stake, and the case admits of no other evidence; but neither is it an occasion of this kind. Moreover, they by whom this oath is required do not pretend that we are under any obligation to swear it, or to enter into their society, and therefore, by refusing to take it we do them no injury, infringe on no right of theirs, deprive them of no privilege.

These things will not admit of a doubt. What then is it which makes the occasion? There is something in secrecy which naturally excites curiosity. That curiosity excited may be gratified, is one principal part of the occasion.\* Take this away, and we are persuaded there is not one out of a hundred of those who have taken this oath, that would have taken it. But it will be said, (though not by the scriptures which are able to make the man of God perfect,) that this hidden *something* or *nothing* called masonry, has many advantages connected with it. Let a mason go for example, to any part of the world, and be in need or distress, he will find friends.†— Besides, it has a long list of great names. Kings and conquerors, philosophers, lawyers, statesmen, and judges, have been, and still are masons; and a poor man, who is a free and accepted mason, has the pride of thinking, that he has raised himself, in this point, to equality with all these great men.

\* This has been declared to be the truth since, by a number who have renounced it.

† This is admitted, and the promise viewed abstractly, is, no doubt, very alluring; but as explained by recent events, it means, let a mason be a kidnapper, a murderer, or let him be concerned in any villanous project against his country, or his neighbour, who is not a mason, and let him be in want of money or assistance to carry it on, or in danger of apprehension by the officers of justice, in any part of the world, and he will find friends. But this, so far from recommending masonry to the adoption of a righteous man, is enough to make him recoil with horror, as from a fiend of the pit. "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united."

Each of these things is esteemed weighty, and has a powerful influence on a carnal mind; but what has a Christian to do with them? What has the son of the King of kings, the heir of a crown and a kingdom eternal, to do with them? What respect does the Confession show them? will any, or all of them together, make what it deems a "just occasion?" What child of God, would not shudder at the daring impiety of appealing to the Eternal Jehovah, as a judge upon his throne, on the occasion of gratifying a vain curiosity?—would he not recoil from the danger of profaning that great and glorious Name, for the *advantages* and *honours* of an unknown something? Were I, Sir, to propose, in these times when error and division abounds, and when the real sentiments and practice of christian denominations are so ambiguous, that it is scarcely possible any more to find them out from standard books; and when a spurious charity like some deadly contagion is polluting our spiritual atmosphere, and affecting almost every community with sympathy; not for the persons of men, but for their errors and delusions; were I to propose, that all the lovers of Reformation principles, of Bible truth, should swear to hold fast these truths even at the risk of their lives, and to use every degree of diligence to transmit them pure and entire to another generation; (than which, there is not an occasion more just on earth, more important to every interest of man, or more countenanced in Scripture,) my proposition would be opposed by as many, almost, as I would wish to oppose the the oath in question: and yet with unblushing face, they will plead for prostituting that awfully solemn ordinance of worship, to trifles.\*

The Confession says, "Therefore, to swear vainly or rashly by that glorious name, is sinful and to be abhorred." Can the oath in question be freed from this charge? We have seen that every duty to fellow men, every duty required in the word of God, can be performed without it. And these comprehend all the duties of human life throughout all the possible variety of office, occupation and relation. What purpose then does it serve, which can not be equally well accomplished without it? If it serve no distinct purpose, it must be *vain*.

When a man swears this oath he has, it is said, no particular knowledge of what he is binding himself to do. Whether or not, this is *rash* swearing will not admit of a doubt with any possessed of common sense, and not already biassed. There is no parallel to it among the transactions of human life. In vain do you propose to the simplest man in the commercial

\* In the support of this statement, we have a mass of evidence. Those who have been acquainted with masonry, in many degrees, and for many years, and who have communicated all to the world, have shown it to be made up of the most absurd mummery, below the dignity of man.

circle, to sign an obligation before he reads it. No man that values his liberty, will swear allegiance to a constitution of civil government, of which he knows nothing. The very circumstance of keeping it secret would excite a suspicion in his mind, that something in it was not right. No man that places a just value on his life, or the comforts of his family, will engage himself by oath, to fight in a cause till he has examined it, and found it consonant with justice.

How then can any man, taking the Bible as the rule of his faith and practice, swear to do he knows not what, (a thing without precept or example,) and yet not swear rashly? He cannot. This oath then, is unquestionably vain and rash, and therefore "sinful, and to be abhorred."\*

The Confession says, "Yet in matters of weight and moment an oath is lawful by the word of God, neither may a man bind himself by an oath to any thing but what is good and just, and what he believeth so to be, and is able and resolved to perform." But how is it possible in this case, for the juror to know whether or not the matter be of *weight and moment*? All is a profound secret until the oath be taken. While he is in the act of swearing, there is not a single definite idea of it in his mind. How then does he know before he takes the oath, whether the "matter be good and just" or not? For any thing he knows, this oath may, in some cases, set aside all his previous obligations to God and man. He has no assurance before he takes this oath, that it will not bind him to save the enemy of his country, provided he be a mason; that it will not oblige him, when a witness, to conceal the truth, when it would make against any of his fraternity, and in favour of one not belonging to it; that it will not call on him when a juryman, to give a more favourable verdict, if the pannel be a brother, than he would otherwise do; and that it will not bias his mind when a judge to give sentence contrary to the law. All this may possibly be the case.† Now what is there in masonry to counterbalance the hazard of such evils? But I might say in truth, that this is more than a bare possibility. In those districts of the country where masonry greatly prevails, it may be gathered from

\* And besides, all of the oaths which have yet come to light, are in themselves to be abhorred; because if masonry be what is pretended, and if a man cannot deserve the name of Christian without it, it is horrible wickedness to conceal it at all, much more so to exclude from it, absolutely the half of the human family, the female sex. Besides it horribly perverts texts of Scripture. It assumes that the incarnate son of God belonged to one of their orders of knighthood: and that the three persons of the adorable Trinity, were masons, and that the masons of the same degree, now are their successors. See a diploma published in an address by a seceding mason, in the west of this state, to professors of religion.

\* All this is the case, otherwise it would have been impossible that justice in Morgan's case could have been so defeated. A brother of some degrees, must be supported let him be right or wrong, and he must be shielded from justice though guilty of treason and murder.



the whispers, and murmurs current, that not a doubt remains in the minds of many respectable persons, of the real existence of all these evils. If they do exist, masonry cannot be innocent; and it may be the secret instrument of the most horrible disasters to church and state, which they have ever experienced. If this be only the conjecture of the writer, then why have some of the most enlightened nations thought it needful to lay it under certain limitation, and others to prohibit it altogether? It will hardly be disputed, that in those parts of the States where masonry has been extensively entered into, that it is in vain to set up any one not of the brotherhood, as a candidate for office; in vain to attempt to carry any public measure, how obvious soever its advantages, unless the attempt be made by them. Therefore I would repeat it, that a man before this oath is taken, has no sufficient evidence to believe that he is not binding himself virtually to conceal a scheme, if devised by freemasons, for overthrowing the constitution, or for subverting the plainest truths of the Bible. But it is plead, that the freemasons have on some occasions distinguished themselves as friends to some public institutions, and that they have relieved widows, &c. Sir, if they were to lay out all the money which is devoted to revelling and drunkenness, on charitable purposes, say Bible and Missionary societies, the nature of masonry would be just what it is now. I heard some time ago, that a stage company in the Theatre of ——— generously agreed to let the benefit of one night be given to the Bible Society! must I therefore believe that the Theatre is a "school of virtue?" I have somewhere read of a devil preaching the gospel! and a spirit of divination proclaiming this great truth "These men are the servants of the most high God, and show unto us the way of salvation," must I therefore conclude that Hell has become friendly to the free grace of God and the salvation of souls? The reasoning in the one case, is the same as it would be in the other.

To prove the matter of it to be just, we are frequently told that the principles and rules of masonry are consonant with the Scriptures. Some short time ago, I read a piece published by themselves, which boasted "that men of all descriptions—Jews, Mahometants, Turks, Savages, Philosophers, and Christians, meet in their cordial brotherhood, and laying aside all other distinction, join in worshipping the one supreme and universal God." Then, Sir, I suppose I must admit that *principles consonant with the Scriptures* are congenial to the views and feelings of this incongruous mass! As soon will light and darkness be amalgamated—as soon will Hell and Heaven meet in love. Without exceeding the bounds of truth, the writer referred to, might have included the infidel, the

drunkard, the unclean, the profane swearer, the Sabbath breaker, and the vicious of almost every description.

What has an heir of glory to do with such a motly mixture? How can he expect to find in *that*, which can possibly be congenial to the views and feelings of all these, any thing peculiar to the Gospel or accordant with the love of God? How can it be consistent for him, who has vowed not to sit in the seat of the scornful, or stand in the way of sinners, to meet with such? How is it possible for the *matter* to be "just and good?"

The Confession says that an oath may be "imposed by lawful authority." By what authority, I ask, is this oath imposed? It is neither civil nor ecclesiastical, nor public authority of any description. It is a nameless and unknown authority, of whose nature we must be ignorant, until we have actually submitted to it. Upon what ground can we conclude that to be a lawful authority, which is constituted neither by the laws of God nor by the laws of the state?

In the same manner might it be shown, that a man cannot on any sound principle "resolve to perform that to which he swears" in this case, nor "believe he is *able* to perform it."

But I may be told, that I do not know what masonry is, and therefore my reasoning may not be applicable. Still I may know with certainty what it is *not*, and by this means I shall obtain sufficient data to support all the conclusions I have drawn.

I know that the whole principles of the Gospel dwell in the clearest light, and powerfully constrain every mind which embraces them, to diffuse the knowledge of them, without limitation or condition. Masonry does *not*; it dwells in thick darkness; it invokes the aid of Jehovah's name to bar out the light. The moment it would present itself in open day, it would expire and become extinct. From this, I infer, that its very *essence* is directly the opposite of the spirit of Revelation.

I know that the Bible addresses itself as much to women and children, as to men—that its maxims and doctrines elevate the female to her own proper importance, as a companion for man—that it adorns her character with a divine loveliness, which makes her the brightest ornament of human kind. Masonry treats her with sullen silence, and leaves her comfortless, among her tender offspring, to weep. I know that its principles are *not* necessary to make a good citizen, a good neighbour, a good husband, a good parent, or a good Christian. I know certainly, that it is *not* necessary to the safety or prosperity of the State, or of the church.\* I know that it is *not* necessary, to the most useful and honourable life, or to the most safe and happy death, and this is enough for me. Sir, if any of your readers have unhappily been drawn into this dark

\* But it is admirably calculated to effect the ruin of both, and if allowed to continue in its present power, it *will* do it.

monopoly, in which he dare not allow the wife of his bosom, or his children, or his dearest and most faithful friends to participate, I would urge him to review the deed in the light of God's word, and renounce it as a heinous sin. It is not unlikely, that some may still consider the whole subject of this paper a trifling affair, and not worthy of having so much said about; yet, it would not be very difficult to trace immorality of almost every species, to indifference about the taking of an oath, which must have place in all the cases above-mentioned. The first effect of it is, to destroy any remaining impressions of the omniscience and omnipresence of God on the mind.—When this effect is complete, there will then be “no fear of God before his eyes.” When a sinner gets fairly above the fear of God, he will not much regard man. Every other restraint on the conduct imperceptibly loses strength, and at last fails to hold back the flood of iniquity swelling in the heart; and then it carries all before it. Thus, it is but a very few steps from this wicked indifference about an oath, to an open and entire abandonment of one's self to every vice.

That it is different, in any instance, is owing to God's restraining power and the influence of better principles. I therefore beseech the reader, not to consider it a light matter.

It is a sin indeed little thought of, even by those entrusted with the execution of good and wholesome laws. They can very easily excuse it, and admit abatements and palliations; but the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain. Reader, if the guilt of this sin lies upon you, and you have never sought to wash it away in the blood of the Lamb, be not surprised, if God holds back his blessing; if you are neither comforted nor edified by divine ordinances, if he meet you at every turn with a frown in his face. You have insulted him. You have trampled on his authority—disregarded his threatenings—and belied all your professions of love and obedience. How can he be but angry? Will not this cast a doubt upon the interest of your soul in him as your God? and if death should overtake you in this state of doubt and fear, how much to be pitied is your situation! How will the thought that you so profaned that blessed name, lacerate your feelings and distract your mind, at that moment, when you are placed beyond the reach of all earthly comfort!

In a word, bring your thoughts about God often under review, make it the burden of your prayer, that his fear may rule continually in your hearts, and manifest itself through the whole of your deportment.

G.

## REMARKS

On Romans viii. 19—23.

1. By the word *creature*, which occurs three times in these verses, I understand, "the whole creation," as expressed ver. 22; more especially the irrational part. The word in the original, rendered *creation* in this verse, is the same that is, in the other verses, rendered *creature*.

2. By *vanity*, (ver. 20.) I understand all the oppression, sufferings, and death, to which the creatures are subjected on account of the sin of man. The same thing is intended, (ver. 20.) by "bondage of corruption;" and (ver. 22.) by "groaning and travailing in pain." This will even apply to the inanimate part of creation, as sun, moon, and stars, which have been prostituted as objects of idolatrous worship.

3. All that is said of the creature, is a striking instance of the rhetorical figure called personification, in which irrational creatures are brought to view, expressing themselves in the same manner as rational and intelligent creatures do. As the whole sense of the passage depends upon this figure, it is necessary to bring to view some instances of its occurrence, for the sake of illustration. Judges ix. 8—15.—"The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them: and they said to the olive-tree, reign thou over us. But the olive-tree said unto them, should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honour God and man, and go to be promoted over the tress. And the trees said to the fig-tree, come thou and reign over us," &c. Ps. xcvi. 11, 12.—"Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the fields be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice." Ps. xcvi. 8.—"Let the floods clap their hands: let the hills be joyful together." In Ps. cxlviii. 7—10.—"Dragons, fire, hail, snow, vapour, stormy wind," &c. are called on to praise God. Isa. i. 2.—"Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth." Isa. xlv. 23.—"Sing, O heavens, for the Lord hath done it: shout ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein." By the same figure, the dead are brought to view, expressing themselves as if really alive, Jer. xxxi. 15, 16. Rachel was dead more than 1200 years before this, yet she is brought to view as bewailing the calamities of her posterity in the Babylonish captivity. In like manner at the opening of the fifth seal, (Rev. vi. 9—11.) the souls of the slain are brought to view as calling for vengeance on their murderers, as Abel's blood is said to cry to the Lord from the ground. As the scriptures abound



with this figure, more instances could be given, but the above selection is judged sufficient. We are, then, to view the inferior creatures personified in the passage before us, and that they would express themselves, in the manner asserted, were they capable.

4. Verse 20 is a parenthesis, explanatory of what is asserted in ver. 19. The passage would have been rendered much more intelligible, had the parenthetic marks been expressed, as they are, both in Tremillius' and Beza's Latin versions. All that is expressed, under the figure of personification, is contained in verses 19 and 21. The other verses are a plain declaration of matters of fact.

5. The 21st verse seems to be a declaration by the apostle, that the inferior creatures shall be admitted into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Hence has arisen the absurd sentiment of the future resurrection of the inferior creatures: and a sentiment still more absurd, that some of the creatures will be admitted to this glorious condition, by being eaten and incorporated with the bodies of saints, and be glorified in their resurrection.

6. *In hope*, in the end of ver. 20. ought to have been placed at the beginning of ver. 21. as they are in the Greek; and the word rendered *because*, ought to have been rendered *that*. Then, by connecting ver. 21. with ver. 19. it will evidently express the action of the personified creatures, and no declaration of the apostle, as the present version seems to intimate; and from which have arisen so many various conjectures.

7. In ver. 23, the apostle expresses in plain language, that not only inferior creatures, but even the children of God, who are partakers of grace, and heirs of glory, are subjected to oppression, sufferings and death: but encourages himself and other believing sufferers, with the consideration of a glorious liberty and exemption from all sufferings, beyond death and the grave.

8. According to these remarks, the verses may be rendered more correctly in the following manner:

(Verse 19.) "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. (ver. 20.) For the creature was subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him, who subjected it to vanity; (ver. 21.) in hope that the creature itself, also, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," &c.

The sense of the passage may be summed up in a few words. So blessed and glorious is the future rest of the children of God, and free from all suffering and pain, that even inferior creatures themselves, would earnestly desire it, were they capable of ap-

preciating its worth: for even they have been involuntarily subjected to grievous oppression, by Adam's disobedience, who brought misery and death, not only on himself and posterity, but even upon the inferior creatures. For the divine displeasure was marked against sin, by pronouncing the curse against them and the earth, for man's rebellion. Even the children of the covenant, the present partakers of divine grace, and destined heirs of eternal glory, are subjected to sufferings and death; to which all are liable, but from which they shall at last be fully delivered, in the blessed resurrection of the just, when their vile bodies shall be raised up immortal and glorious; and so shall they be ever with the Lord.

D.

---

FOR THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

THE SEPERATE CONSTITUTION AND COMMUNION OF THE  
ASSOCIATE CHURCH VINDICATED.

PART I.

*On the Organization of the Catholic Visible Church.*

*(Continued from page 10.)*

4. THE deed of constituting the church, is simply a deed of covenant. Ezek. xvi. 8.—“Yea, I sware unto thee, and entered into covenant with thee, saith the Lord GOD, and thou becamest mine.” She became, or was constituted, the church of the Lord God, by covenant. In ver. 60. and 61. we are informed of a change of dispensation, to take place upon the accession of the Gentiles to the fellowship of the church, and yet it is promised that this improved state of the church, with all the increase of numbers, and liberty of worship attending it, shall be established and secured by covenant. “I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant;—and I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord.” These words do indeed imply, that the covenant of grace, is eternally and unalterably confirmed with all believers in Christ; yet there is certainly a visible appearance, and deed of Jehovah, in behalf of his visible church, here intended. It is only by a covenant of duty,—by an external profession and engagement,—that the covenant of grace can be visibly established with believers, or in any manner established with the visible catholic body as such; many of them in every age, being internally in a state of unbelief, and therefore really “strangers to the covenant of promise.” The proselyte to the Jewish religion was reckoned to have taken hold of God's covenant. Isaiah lvi. 6. Thus the baptized person is said to have “put on Christ.” Gal. iii. 27. The Spirit, in Ezekiel, certainly

has reference to some federal engagement, under which the body of the Israelitish people were. Such an engagement they were under from the loins of their father Abraham. Ps. cv. 9; or at least, by the deed of their ancestors at Horeb. Jer. xi. 10. And as it was by those ancient, and memorable deeds of Jehovah, and his people, uniting in solemn compact, that the Old Testament church was erected, and made to stand firm for the time being; so upon the same basis, in substance,—an external covenant,—is founded the New Testament church, to endure to the latest ages. We must here refer the reader to that solemn mediatorial action of Christ, by which the ministry, membership, and privileges of his church, were transferred from the ancient holders of them to his New Testament disciples, and they confirmed in the possession of them, till the end of the world. Luke xxii. 29. "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." It is well known, by what instrument the Father hath appointed a kingdom to his Son. Ps. lxxxix. 3, 4. "I have made a covenant with my chosen,—I will build up thy throne to all generations." But the words of the Evangelist, if literally rendered, are equally explicit. For there is not a closer analogy, either in form or in signification, between any two words in any language, than there is between the one in the above text which is rendered—'*I appoint*,'\* and the Greek name for covenant.† Our Lord's words are plainly as follows;—"I do covenant to you a kingdom, as my Father hath covenanted to me." And these words express a mediatorial and kingly action. For when Christ the King of Zion says,—"I give unto you eternal life,—Take, eat, this is my body," or—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost," he is not simply foretelling what will be, but he is by his royal authority, *ordaining* and declaring what shall be. His divine, and mediatorial authority, gives strength and being to his words. These words then imply action,—a royal and munificent deed of donation, in which the visible relation subsisting by profession, or external covenant, between Christ and his disciples, is solemnly recognized,—all former grants are renewed,—the whole ministry, membership, and privileges, of the Old Testament church, in so far as these were not ceremonial, (and therefore to be abolished) are conveyed and confirmed to the original members of the new,—to them and their legitimate successors forever. And as there is a distinction here made, between the Father's covenanting with his Son, and the Son's covenanting with his people, between the eternal covenant of grace and a covenant of duty constructed in time, so the former of these is made the basis of the latter. The

\* *Diatithemai*.

† *Diatheke*.

gospel revelation of the eternal covenant, on Christ's part, professed acceptance of it, on our part, are all that is requisite to form the mutual engagement, which constitutes us members of his visible body. Gal. iii. 27. This promise of our Saviour to give us the kingdom, has indeed a more spiritual force and efficacy to be apprehended by faith and realized by all true believers, but its relevancy to external church fellowship, as explained above, is not thereby diminished. The connection of this memorable *de-  
cree* and *constitution* of our Lord, with the *institution* of the holy supper, is very remarkable. Luke xxii. 19—30. "*This cup*," he had said, "*is the new covenant in my blood*," and in a few moments he adds, "*I do covenant to you a kingdom*." There was but a pentecost,—an interval of fifty days as some suppose,—intervened between the institution of the passover, and the solemn engagement made at Sinai. Ex. xii. 6 and xix. 1. 11. The Lord's supper having succeeded the passover, introduces without delay, or rather is attended with, a new deed of covenant. Another proof that the visible church, even under the new dispensation, still subsists by virtue of an external covenant union with her Divine and exalted Head, may be had from Jer. xxxi. 31 and Heb. viii. 8. Now there existed under the old testament two species of covenant,—the one of grace and the other of duty. By the former, all true believers were saved. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. Acts xv. 11. By the latter, all who professed to be believers took hold of God's covenant *externally*, Isa. lvi. 6, *avouched the Lord to be their God*, and said "*all that the Lord hath spoken we will do,—all that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient,—nay but we will serve the Lord*." Deut. xxvi. 17. Ex. xix. 8. and xxiv. 7. Josh. xxiv. 21. *That* was a covenant made with Christ, and fulfilled by his obedience and blood. Ps. lxxxix. 3. Zech. ix. 11. *This* was to be kept by his people, and upon their continued keeping of it was founded their external evidence of any interest in the blessings of the former. Ex. xix. 5. Ps. ciii. 18. It may well be termed (whatever were its peculiarities, arising from a ceremonial dispensation) *a covenant of duty*. For it was bottomed upon the solid basis of the ten commandments, and bound the covenanter to a faithful performance of the duties enjoined in them. Deut. v. 2—22. But do both these species of covenant exist under the new dispensation? We answer they do. But are we not told that one of them "*waxeth old and vanisheth away*?" We are informed by the Spirit that one of those *covenants*,—but not that one of those *species* or *kinds* of covenant "*waxeth old and vanisheth away*." And which of the two this is, we have expressly declared to us, "*the covenant that I made with your fathers in the*



day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they brake." This is obviously the engagement entered into at Horeb. This individual covenant, so often renewed at various periods of reformation, was distinguished from every other of the same kind, by a vast assemblage of figurative rites now abolished, Eph. ii. 15, and is therefore done away. But will no new covenant of the same kind succeed the one which hath vanished? Yea, "*Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah.*" But is not this the covenant of grace, called new in comparison with the covenant of works, which is old? We answer, the covenant of grace is no doubt intended here, as it respects all true believers, and the Spirit would call off the attention of the Hebrews, from a covenant in many things shadowy and carnal, upon which however they ignorantly rested, to fix it upon the covenant of grace, and its Divine Head, who is the glorious substance. But we must likewise answer, that it is not *solely* the eternal compact between the Father and Son, as embraced in the gospel revelation by all true believers, that is intended. That covenant is everlasting, and cannot, in a strict and proper sense, be more new at one time than at another. It had been often made with believers, as to the application of it, under the Old Testament, and this could not have been predicted by the prophet as a thing wholly future. Above all, this covenant of grace, properly so called, is not, and cannot be, made with the whole visible body, consisting always of believers and unbelievers promiscuously. But there is some covenant made "*with the house of Israel and the house of Judah,*" whose "*fathers*" the Lord "*took by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt.*" The great assembly of Israelites, who confederated with God at Sinai, cannot be considered as the fathers, in any sense, of Gentile believers *as such*, under the New Testament. But they are the *ecclesiastical* fathers of all who profess the true religion,—the predecessors of all visible church members. "*The body is one, and hath many members,*" (1 Cor. xii. 12.) even many generations of members. It is therefore true, that a new covenant of duty, is made in these last days with the Catholic church of christian professors. It is new, not *in kind*, but in some of the *articles* of it, and in some of the *formalities* attending the making of it. Every thing that was ceremonial, either in matter or manner, being abolished,—all that was moral, that is, all the fundamental parts of it,—is allowed to remain, with the institution, or rather the substitution of a few new ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's supper. Thus it appears that two species of cove-

nant existed under the Old Testament, and that two continue to exist under the New. To deny this, is to destroy the distinction between the visible church, and the invisible. It is to maintain, that none may be admitted to church fellowship but true saints, and that all they have a right to be admitted, whatever may be their disorders, either in faith or practice. We have only to add on this point, that the same name, is frequently used to denote God's covenant both with the visible, and the invisible church,—and that this form of expression is common to both Testaments. Thus circumcision is the token of God's covenant, in this double sense. Gen. xvii. 10, 11. For it was on the one hand “*a seal of the righteousness of faith.*” Rom. iv. 11. And on the other, it implied an engagement “*to keep the whole law.*” Gal. v. 3. Yea the uncircumcised person is said to have “*broken God's covenant.*” Gen. xvii. 14. And thus the sacramental cup “*is [a sign of] the new covenant in Christ's blood.*” Luke xxii. 20. But the unworthy communicant, is “*guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.*” 1 Cor. xi. 27. Which is further explained, when the lapsed christian, is said to have “*counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing.*” Heb. x. 29. In these two last instances, it is only with an external covenant, and symbolical blood, that the unworthy (in the fullest sense,) and the apostate, can have any connection. In a word, the term *kingdom* is employed, in almost innumerable instances, to express, at the same time, the kingdom of grace, or of glory,—and the visible church-state. Besides the instance above given, see Mat. xix. 14. Heb. xii. 28. By the same figure of speech may one term,—covenant, be used to denote the two distinct charters of these two distinct kingdoms, the one internal, and the other external.

For the further elucidation of this subject, I mean the act of constituting the visible church, let me beg the reader's attention to the few following particulars : 1st. This constitutory act includes in it two distinct actions, of two different agents,—Christ, or God in Christ,—and his people. The one party calls and commands. The other responds and engages. Ex. xix. 5—8. “*If ye will obey my voice and keep my covenant. All that the Lord hath spoken we will do.*” Considering the people's act, however, to be nothing but a compliance with the Divine call, the whole deed may be attributed to God in the person of his Son. It is God's covenant. Now the stated exhibition of Christ, made in the gospel, and the command to sinners to believe on him, amount to such a call; and any person's joining himself to the

avowed followers of Christ, implies at least a tacit compliance. Jer. iii. 22.

2d. This act of response must, to all who have been hailed by the gospel, be the sole thing wanting to form the compact, and constitute them members of the great ecclesiastical body. The following are some of the phrases by which it is expressed in the scripture. *Avouching the Lord to be our God. Entering into covenant with him.* Deut. xxvi. 17, and xxix. 12. *Joining of ourselves to the Lord.* Jer. 1. 5. *Swearing the Lord liveth.* Jer. iv. 2. *Swearing to him.* Isa. xlv. 23. *Confessing to his name.* 1 Kings viii. 33, 35. *Confessing that Jesus is Christ.* Philip. ii. 11. *Confessing with the mouth the Lord Jesus.* Rom. x. 9. *The professing of a good profession before many witnesses.* 1 Tim. vi. 12.

3d. The term *profession*, or *confession*, (which are one in the original,) precisely expresses the idea of acceding to federal terms offered, and of entering into covenant. "If we survey the writings of the New Testament," says an intelligent and lucid writer, "the term will be found to express such covenants, as are confirmed with oaths. When Judas accepted of the offer, which the chief priests and captains made him, his engagement is expressed by a term of nearly the same composition. *'They covenanted to give him money, and he promised,—Greek, he confessed,\* or made confession.* Luke xxii. 6. Here it imports the acceptance of federal terms, and a federal engagement on the part of Judas. Herod's covenant, which was also ratified with an oath, is expressed by a term of the very same derivation, with that under consideration. *'When Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them and pleased Herod. Wherefore he promised,† Gr. he confessed, or made confession with an oath, to give her whatever she would ask.'* Mat. xiv. 7. The authors of the translation styled the Septuagint, (according to the Alexandrine M. S.) use the same term, to express an oath and word by God himself, to confirm a threatening. *'Behold I have sworn by my great name saith the Lord.'* Jer. xlv. 26. Yea it has a special fitness to express the duty for which we contend,—the duty of public covenanting,—"as well as civil contracts, or wicked combinations;—as it is used both by classic authors in the Greek language, and by the aforesaid authors of the Septuagint, to denote a vow, which is nothing else than a sacred covenant." Our author then refers to Budeus on Herodotus, and to the Septuagint of Lev. xxii. 18, and Jer. xlv. 25. The last of these texts, as it stands in the Septuagint, may be Englished thus,—*"Thus*

\* *Exomologese.*

† *Omologese.*

saith the Lord the God of Israel, ye women with your mouths have spoken, and with your hands have fulfilled, saying, performing we will perform our *confessions*, which we have *confessed*, to burn incense to the queen of the heavens, and pour out libations to her; abiding ye have abode in your *confessions*, and performing ye have performed." In a foot note to the above extract, the learned Pasor is introduced as defining the Greek *homologia* (which we render *confession*,) to be a mutual stipulation, a stipulation offered by one person and ratified by another's acceptance of it; as when one enquires "Do you consent? the other replies, "I consent." The latter is said properly to make *homologia*, a *confession*, i. e. to assent, and with his own profession bind himself to perform. The word literally signifies to *speak together*, or to *unite in the same words*. Hornberg, another eminent critic is cited, as saying that *homologia* is a *paction*, *agreement*, *surrender*; and that to prove this by examples is unnecessary, because the lexicons are full of them. Dr. Owen is cited as alleging that the word is used in good authors, for *convention*, *covenant*, *agreement*. Numerous examples are then adduced to the same purpose, from the Greek classics, particularly as collected by Stephanus.\*

But as the import of the original term in the New Testament, for *confession*, or *profession*, is all important in this subject,—permit us to refer here to an infallible interpreter, both of doctrine and language. The Holy Spirit explains the duty of *swearing to the Lord*, to be the same thing with *confessing*,—*making confession*. Isa. xlv. 23, 24, compared with Rom. xiv. 11, and Phil. ii. 11. The Hebrew text of Isaiah is translated by Harvey, the eloquent advocate of imputed righteousness, as follows: "By myself have I sworn, the word of righteousness goeth out of my mouth, the word shall not return. To me every knee shall bow, and every tongue SHALL SWEAR, saying, surely in the Lord have I righteousness and strength. To him shall men come, and all that are offended in him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and in him shall they glory." After some able criticisms on the words, he concludes: "This then shall be the form of your OATH, such the tenor of your CONFESION."† The solemnity of *swearing to Jehovah*, was well known as the most formal mode of confederating with him, under the old dispensation. And that Jehovah, to whom this sworn affiance, according to the oath of Jehovah, is due, the

\* See Muirhead's *Dissertations*, pa. 559, 560.

† *Aspasio Vindicated*, pa. mihi, 56—58.



Spirit declares by the apostle, to be the Lord Jésus Christ; and *that oath of fealty and affiance*, he expounds to be a *confession to his Lordship*,—"the confessing that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." Perhaps the apostle's words, if properly disposed, may contain rather a confession of his Messiahip, (in which his justifying righteousness, and saving strength consist,) "confess that the Lord Jesus is the Christ, to the glory of God the Father." It is in vain to attempt, as some have done, to evade the application of this DECREE AND CONSTITUTION OF JEHOVAH, to the duty of making a solemn christian profession,—by referring it wholly to the final judgment. It is neither wholly, nor principally, referred to that by the apostle. But from the solemn injunction laid upon all to acknowledge the supreme Lordship of Christ, he deduces the inference, that all must account to him, for the performance of this and other duties, in the great day of judgment. "*For it is written,*" says he, "*So THEN, (ara oun) every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.*" The particles in the commencement of verse 12, are the plainest which the Greek language affords, to express an inference. The application of the sentence to the general judgment, in any other way than by inference, is full of horrible absurdity. Will all who stand before the judgment seat of Christ, devils and reprobate men not excepted, solemnly swear to him, and that by the very fact of their appearance there, and in compliance with the command and oath of the Father,—that, "In him they have righteousness and strength?" This is the tenor of the oath to be sworn, of the confession to be made, whatever be the fact to which it immediately relates.

It only remains to be noticed of the action of confessing, or professing Christ, that it constitutes a visible relation to him. For whether the profession be true or false, it implies, that an internal union, between him and the professor, does exist; as is obvious from the structure of the words, especially in the original language, Luke xii. 8. "*Whosoever shall confess IN ME, (Gr.) before men, IN HIM, (Gr.) shall the Son of man also confess before the Angels of God.*" So in Mat. x. 32. To confess in one is to avow an interest in him; and from this a corresponding obligation to him arises.

4th. This part of the act constitutory, which belongs to church members, must, in its very nature, always be *public*. It is a profession made *before men*. Timothy "*professed a good profession before many witnesses.*" 1 Tim. vi. 13. If we take our Lord for our example, we will never refuse, when called or adjured, by civil or ecclesiastical rulers, to stand before them, as public confessors.

and martyrs of the truth. Mat. xxvi. 63, 64. It is recorded to the reproach of some who believed in him, that "*they did not confess him,*" i. e. publicly, "*lest they should be put out of the synagogue.*" Israel's re-stipulation to the Divine call, was so openly given before the universe, that Moses calls Heaven and Earth to witness against them in case of perfidy. Deut. iv. 23—26. The followers of the Lamb stand publicly with him on the height of Mount Zion; the eyes of angels, men and devils, can read in their foreheads their profession,—that is "*the name of their Father written in their foreheads.*" Rev. xiv. 1—3.

5th. This act constitutory, or deed of covenant on the people's part, ought in every case of erecting a particular church, or of receiving a member, to be *formal and explicit*. It was so in the many examples recorded in scripture, as cited above. The original word, as defined above, implies so much,—*to speak with,—to unite in the same words*. It is a confession made with *the mouth,—with the tongue*. Rom. x. 9. Isa. xlv. 24. These are the organs of speech, and not the instruments merely of symbolical action. The same deed, as carrying in it the use of the voice, is frequently termed a *calling*,—"the calling upon,—or calling one's self by, the name of Jehovah." Gen. iv. 26. It is a call amounting to an engagement "*to serve the Lord with one consent.*" Zeph. iii. 9. Nor must the hand refuse to concur with the tongue, in a matter which so deeply interests the whole man,—it must not decline the formality of registering the words uttered, or of subjoining its signature to the form of a bond. Isa. xlv. 5.

6th. Yet this federal engagement of a professing people, *may be made tacitly*, and *by symbol*, where neither any written nor verbal form of covenant exists. It is so made in the sacraments, which are seals both of God's covenant to us, and of our engagements to him. This appears from the double sense in which the word covenant is taken in the New Testament, and from the fact of every baptized person's having put on Christ. Gal. iii. 27. He is put on as a Head and Lord, among other of his characters. The same engagement is publicly made, in every act of public solemn worship, and a solemn compact is formed between the God of ordinances, and the worshipper. Heb. xiii. 15. "*By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name.*" "*Giving thanks,*" Gr. "*making confession, to his name.*"

7th. In whatever way the people's professed accession to God's call is given, he acknowledges them, as united with himself, in a marriage covenant. Jer. ii. 2. "*Thus saith the Lord I remember the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when*

thou wentest after me in the wilderness." This is termed "the Lord's avouching of them to be his people." Deut. xxvi. 17. He immediately claims them, by virtue of this external surrender of themselves, as his peculiar people; and notwithstanding any secret want of sincerity in them, he styles them "brethren of the Lord, and saints." Heb. ii. 11, 12. 1 Cor. i. 2. He admits their claims to all the external privileges of the church, to be used only in "the due order," and bestows upon them all that tender care and preservation, (in things relating to their external privileges,) which, to true believers, form such a real, and affecting proof of his special love and mercy. Isa. lxiii. 7, 8. "I will mention the loving kindness of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel which he hath bestowed on them, according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his loving kindnesses." The reason assigned, for the bestowment of the blessings, is, "For he said surely they are my people, children that will not lie, so he was their Saviour." "They are children that WILL NOT LIE," having made a profession, they will not belie it. He takes them at their word.

In strict accordance with this acknowledgment of the marriage union, is God's reproof and chastisement of his irregular and apostatizing professors, as being guilty of unchastity and perfidy. Rev. ii. 4. "Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love." Ezek. xvi. 38. "And I will judge thee as women, that break wedlock, and shed blood, are judged." Admonitions and corrections for the sin of a church's forsaking the law of her espousals, not proving salutary, and a begun apostacy being obstinately continued in, and increased, subjects herself, at last, to the fearful curse of being utterly repudiated and unchurched. "My covenants they broke, and I regarded them not saith the Lord." Heb. viii. 9. See also Rev. ii. 5.

We shall conclude the subject of ecclesiastic constitution, for the present, with the words of a very eminent Theologian, which cannot be suspected of having the interests of any modern sect to support. "Fideles autem," &c. "Yet believers," says he, "do not constitute a particular church merely by having their residence in the same place; but by means of some specific bond, in which they are mutually conjoined for forming this association. For as it is by internal faith, that any become members of the church mystical or catholic; and by the same internal, joined with external faith, that is, with a profession of faith, that any are rendered members of the church militant; so it is by a special

bond that this particular society ecclesiastic, is formally constituted. But that bond is an ecclesiastic confederation, either expressed or implied, by which believers do, in a particular manner, bind themselves to each other, to perform all those duties, both toward God and toward one another, which the peculiar nature, condition, and edification of the church require. Hence in the case of the Old Testament church, we read of a renovation of the covenant, in almost every instance, in which any solemn reformation of the church is recorded. Dent. xxvi. 16. Joshua xxiv. 14—23. 2 Chron. xv. 12, 13, 14. Neh. ix. 38. This confederation is still practised, and continued, in the reception of members into the communion of the church. As in the Old Testament church, this was done by circumcision (called God's covenant, because that by it not only an internal confederation was formed between God and the circumcised, but also an external one with the same deed, between the circumcised and the people of God;) so in the New Testament church, it is done by the analogous sacrament of baptism, by which the baptized is introduced, not only into a covenant internal with God, but also into an external covenant with the church. Whence we are said to be baptized into one body. 1 Cor. xii. 13. To this the baptismal *stipulation*\* of a good conscience has reference, (1 Pet. iii. 21.) which stipulation, the church exacts of the person to be baptized, and he formally renders, previous to her receiving him into her bosom. In these two [exacting and giving] an ecclesiastical confederation undoubtedly consists. The same consideration is made even more explicitly, when the baptized person is admitted to the holy supper. For the person to be admitted, after having openly made confession of his faith, and being solemnly interrogated, in the name of the church, by the person which is to receive him,—promises, that in this confession he will firmly abide, according to his Christian confession, now publicly made, he will continue to walk, and to the discipline of the church, when occasion may call, he will cheerfully submit. All this is done according to a most commendable practice established in the Belgic churches. Nor is any person rightly admitted into the communion of a particular church, but by such a confederation.”—MASTRICHT. *Theolog. Lib. vii. Cap. prim. § xviii.*

\* *Eperotema*, an answer, or response, made by way of promise, to one demanding.



## STRICTURES

*On a series of papers entitled "Brief historical Sketches of the Associate Reformed Church of North America," published in the Religious Examiner, a periodical work edited by the Rev. Samuel Findlay, and printed at Cadiz, Ohio.*

THE Sketches are introduced by a number of fulsome and complimentary remarks on the present state of the Associate Reformed Church. "Such a work," (says the writer, referring to the Sketches) "will be useful in the present day; especially as the present is a day in which this branch of God's Zion is experiencing the most auspicious tokens of the Divine favour, in the number of youth ripening for ministerial agency in her bounds—and in the most expansive scope for the most enlarged exertion of talent and zeal lying before them; as also in the cheering success that attends the proportion of ministerial labour now employed."

Willingly would we join in the rejoicing of the author of these Sketches, had we evidence to believe that the flattering representation, which he gives of the prosperity of the Associate Reformed church, was founded in truth. That she really, at present, enjoyed the most auspicious tokens of the Divine favour, and that the proportion of ministerial labour now employed was favoured with the most abundant *success* in promoting the despised cause of the Redeemer, which we consider as identified with the cause of Reformation principles. But we must say, (and our observation has not been confined only to an individual section of the country where that church is located, but has been extensive,) that in our estimation, these remarks have no applicability to the present state of that church. The ideas of the writer, as to what constitutes the prosperity of a church, seem to be of a very carnal and worldly kind—unexampled increase of numbers, seems, in his estimation, to be a sure criterion of this. But there are those who hold the most heretical principles, and can count thousands of proselytes for the hundreds which the Associate Reformed can do. And are they to be regarded as enjoying the most auspicious tokens of the Divine favour, also? The same is, indeed, urged by them in evidence of this, and with as good reason, as by the writer of these Sketches, in the application which he makes of it. If a wide door is opened—if the reins of discipline are held loose—if a spirit of conformity to the world is not discountenanced; but, with time-serving policy, connived at, it is no difficult matter to gain a rapid increase of members. Besides, we cannot satisfy ourselves that the brethren of the wri-

ter of the Sketches consider the church as at present enjoying such unexampled prosperity; otherwise they would have embraced the proposition submitted to them, at their meeting of synod, last year, at Cadiz, of publicly and solemnly acknowledging the kindness of Jehovah, in vouchsafing such prosperity, by the appointment of a day of thanksgiving. But fast and thanksgiving days are, perhaps, now, like the musty old covenants, become obsolete. Where, likewise, is the evidence of the cheering success attending the prosperity of ministerial labour employed? Is it to be found in the knowledge and establishment of their members in the faith once delivered to the saints? Is there any evidence of the revival of a decayed zeal for the whole truth of God, every article of which is incalculably precious? If the editorial remarks of Mr. Samnel Findlay are to be regarded as a specimen of the sentiments which prevail among his brethren, (and we are assured they are) can an object so devoutly to be wished, as the above, be expected. In speaking of the two parties forming the union, he observes—"It has ever been and still is the declared opinion of the parties concerned, on both sides, that none of the *radical* principles of the christian faith has been relinquished by them;" and subsequently "the same gospel doctrines and consolations are to be found in the Associate Reformed church that constitute ALL THAT IS EXCELLENT IN BOTH THE COVENANTER AND SECEDER CHURCHES." The editor himself, admits, that principles of truth have been relinquished, but no radical ones. But what is a radical principle? It had been well that he had defined this—some make salvation by good works a non-radical—some class the Deity of Christ in the same number; and what are considered radical by some, are considered as non-radical by others—nay, that which has been regarded as a radical principle at one time, has, at another, and by the same persons, been regarded as belonging to this class. So progressive is the course of defection from the truth. But is there any principle of truth in which the glory of God is not involved, and which, by Divine appointment as means, the salvation and comfort of the church does not render necessary? But we have, perhaps, the sense of the editor's views of what is to be regarded as radical, in what follows, namely—"all that is excellent in the Associate and Covenanter churches." The balance, in his account, is only rubbish. If, then, the worthy editor, and the writer of these Sketches, (for the same sentiment is communicated throughout,) and their coadjutors, thus far compromise the cause of God entrusted to their care, and yield themselves up to a time-serving, and men-pleasing spirit—need it be

wondered at, that, in these degenerate days, the portion of ministerial labour employed, be attended with success, so far as respects increase of number? But does this prosperity display itself in the eminent and exemplary piety of their members? In their faithful and conscientious observance of the duties of personal and family religion? If our own observation was appealed to in evidence of the case—we would answer—No. It is notorious, that many are knowingly tolerated in the neglect of family worship, and that many never ask the blessing of God upon their meals. If the truth of this is challenged, facts can be referred to in great abundance; and that not confined to one section of the country. And are these to be regarded as evidences of a church's enjoying auspicious tokens of the Divine favour? Such a representation, therefore, we consider of the most pernicious tendency. It is the practicing of a gross deception on the members of the Associate Reformed church, and it is an endeavour to practice a similar deception on other religious demonstrations.

But having said thus much in animadverting upon the introductory remarks of the writer of the Sketches, and the editorial remarks of the Rev. Samuel Finlay, we proceed to examine the Sketches themselves.

He informs us that previous to his entering on the history, it will be requisite to give some account of the parties forming the union; and first of the Seceders.

The representation which he gives of the origin and grounds of the Secession, and the character of the Original Seceders, is, in general, correct; although deficient in distinctness of detail: but in entering on the memorable controversy respecting the religious clause in some Burgess oaths, the cloven foot of the writer appears; and the rancour of party spirit displays itself in the abuse of the Associate Synod of Scotland, for opposing with unshaken firmness, the swearing, by her members, of contradictory oaths. It is well known, that the introduction of this unhappy subject of dispute into the Associate Synod, was occasioned by an overture, the object of which was the removal of all hindrances to their engaging in the duty of covenanting: And it is a well known fact, that though the Burgher party, all along, maintained the obligation of this ordinance on the church, in New Testament times, and at first contended, that the swearing of the Burgess oath was in accordance with their solemn engagements to duty, they never had the presumption to enter upon the observance of it. So that their contending for the Burgess oath proved the death and burial of covenanting: And, indeed, so

glaringly inconsistent is this oath with the principles of the Secession church, that for twenty years past, no Burgher, either minister or layman, has attempted to justify the swearing of it by a Seceder. In thus recalling, therefore, from their peaceful silence in the grave of oblivion, the arguments by which the Burghers endeavoured to maintain the consistency of taking this oath with their principles as Seceders, the writer has only revived the shame of the party whose cause he seeks to defend. Conscious of this, the Burgher Synod, in their late union with the Anti-burghers, carefully contrived that this subject should be permitted to slumber in undisturbed forgetfulness. It had, therefore, been better for the writer of these Sketches to have acknowledged, (while sharply reproving every thing of unhallowed feeling and passion on both sides,) that the Burghers acted egregiously wrong, in allowing the swearing of an oath, as directly opposed to their profession, as light is to darkness! And yet, strange to say, the writer of these Sketches observes, "it was a question of words! Its import was, whether is the meaning you put on them, or we put on them, right?" Strange, that the swearing of contradictory oaths, is a matter of such moonshine as to be entitled to no better appellation, than a question of words! Strange, too, that it should be a matter of no importance who should have correctly interpreted the oath—whether the one or the other! To what are all questions, then, reducible, but to a mere matter about words, if this is such a one?—Passing the incorrect statement which the writer gives of the different steps of the Synod's procedure in this affair, (and for a correct account of which, see Gib's Display, vol. 2, or, those who are not in possession of this, Alexander and Rufus,) he holds up to the reprobation of all good people the conduct of the Anti-burghers, to whom, unquestionably, the lawful power and authority of the Associate Synod belonged, the editors weighty and witty remarks notwithstanding,\* for employing the ordinance of discipline for the recovery of their fallen brethren, and which, acting according to the views they had of their conduct, they could not have avoided, without an evident dereliction of duty.

\* The editor not satisfied with the portion of abuse and misrepresentation lavishly indulged in, by the writer of the Sketches, against the Anti-burghers, has inserted a foot note, in which he gives his helping hand to the same worthy cause, and seems to vie with the writer in his powers of detraction. He calls the Anti-burgher Synod a self-constituted Synod, and inveighs bitterly against it for passing censure on the Burghers. Moreover, he tells us a witty anecdote which, if he had been in any measure acquainted with historical facts, he would have suppressed. For unless it be possible that a son can bear a different name from that of his father the anecdote cannot be true. The only person that can be alluded to as the son of the venerable father in Zion, is Henry Erskine; but it unfortunately happens that he was on the Burgher side.



But the writer has said nothing of the previous abuse of power practised by the Burghers at Stirling, in which they not only deposed, but passed a sentence of annihilation against the Anti-burghers as an ecclesiastical body—declaring their constitution a mere nullity.

Both parties, the writer observes, persisted in adhering to the Secession Testimony. Now this is not a fact; for, from the time of the breach, there was, on the part of the Burghers, a complete renunciation of further adherence to the Judicial Testimony of the Secession church. Hence their attempt to substitute in its stead—The Statement of Reasons of Secession, &c. published immediately on the occasion of the Secession, and commonly called the extra-judicial testimony: and hence when driven from this subterfuge, the publication, by a committee, of what is called the Re-exhibition. The Burgher Synod, from time to time, gulled their people, as the Associate Reformed Synod did, after their example, by the promise of a Testimony; but the world has never yet seen it. In corroboration of this, the writer of these Strictures will relate the following anecdote; and for the truth of which, he will pledge his veracity.

In the west of Scotland, an elder, belonging to the Burgher connection, waiting from year to year with anxious expectation of the promised Testimony to be emitted by the Burgher Synod, and still disappointed, became uneasy; and on repeated application to his pastor on the subject, was requested by him to call on the Monday after a sacramental occasion about to take place, and he would introduce him to his brethren, who would satisfy him on the subject. The honest elder waited patiently the arrival of the appointed period—was introduced by his pastor to the sacerdotal conclave—when the following dialogue took place:

*1st. Minister.* Have those infernal Anti-burghers been plaguing you?

*Elder.* No; but I wish to know what is our Testimony as a church.

*1st. Min.* You need not be at any loss about that, the Judicial Testimony of the Secession church is our Testimony.

*2d. Min.* Nay, brother, you are mistaken there, for the Re-exhibition is our Testimony.

*3d. Min.* That cannot be brother, for the Re-exhibition was only the deed of a committee, and was never judicially enacted.

At last they were obliged to confess to the honest elder, that at present they had no Testimony; but their Synod intended soon to publish one, and concluded by exhorting him to go home and mind his Bible, and at the day of judgment it would not be ask-

ed him whether he had stood under the banner of a Testimony or not. So shamefully had this body deserted the original principles of the Secession. But the elder now discovering a snake in the grass, and determined to be gulled no longer by such deceitful promises, left them, and connected himself with the Associate body under the banner of the Judicial Testimony of the Secession church.

The writer of the Sketches, in the same paragraph, displays a gross ignorance of the facts connected with the subject on which he writes. He observes that both parties have of late effected a union by petitioning parliament for a repeal of the Burghers oath, (as he denominates it.) Now no such application was ever made. The imposition of the oath never had the legislative sanction of parliament. It was arbitrarily imposed by the magistrates of the four boroughs in which it obtained, and on the union being agitated, perhaps partly by influence used, and partly to gain popularity, was voluntarily relinquished by them. The writer of the Sketches, in a subsequent paragraph, expresses his astonishment that the Associate body in this country, as a branch of the Secession church, should pay any respect to the Burgher controversy. But this is put on the same principle with the opinion that we have no concern in the covenant engagements of our reforming ancestors, in Britain; an opinion, now become very popular in the Associate Reformed church; though once, they solemnly, as we shall afterwards see, professed the contrary. It will certainly be *a new thing in our world*, if the breadth of the Atlantic ocean possesses the power of changing the nature of truth and duty. Can it make the swearing of contradictory oaths, though sinful there, not sinful in this country? Will a passage over the Atlantic have such a purifying influence upon a man, that though polluted with adultery in Scotland, he may be received uncensured into the bosom of the church in this country?

The writer of the Sketches further proceeds to give us a history of the union between the Burghers and Anti-burghers in this country, in which he inveighs bitterly against the Associate Synod in Scotland, for their condemnation of the union and their mission of two ministers with instruction to their American brethren to desolve it. In this part of the Sketches, (and under the covert design of finding matter of accusation against one of the opposers of the subsequent union, out of which sprung the Associate Reformed Church) there is a most unfair representation. It is said the Presbytery unanimously refused to obey these transatlantic orders—and thus the two ministers, not insisting on their

instructions, joined themselves to the Presbytery. So, indeed, says the *Elder*, a pamphlet published by Mr. Annon, and which has been convicted of a variety of falsehoods. The real state of the matter was, as appears from an extract of the minutes of Presbytery, and which is published in Marshal's vindication—"The Presbytery entered on the consideration of the instructions, given by the Synod, to Mr. Rodgers and Mr. Smith, and after long reasoning on that head, and application by a brother to the throne of grace for direction, they find, that in making the union with the Burgher brethren, they have taken some steps inconsistent with their subordination to Synod, and they are determined, for the future, to have no ministerial communion with them, until they lay their case before Synod, and receive further instructions from them; but they do not judge, in present circumstances, it would be for edification to comply with the Synod's demand; which motion was unanimously agreed to, and Mr. Rodgers and Mr. Smith, reckoning that the Synod's demand was materially granted, took their seats in the Presbytery." It is worthy of remark, too, that the basis of this union was the Secession testimony; so that, though, as the writer of the Sketches endeavours to show, Mr. Marshal had fully approbated this union, it would not involve him in inconsistency nor warrant the very honourable title of schismatic by which the Associate Reformed Brethren designated him for opposing the subsequent union, in which the Secession testimony was cast away to the moles and the bats and empty and deceitful promises and ambiguities substituted in its stead.

Having presented a statement of the different articles forming the basis of union (in which it is worthy of remark with what skill in ambiguity and generality of expression they are shaped and accommodated to the faith of the different parties, so that each might please themselves with an interpretation of them in accordance with their previously professed, presently believed principles,) the writer fulminates his anathemas against the worthy Messrs. Marshal and Clarkson for daring to oppose their far famed union. And here I must say, a grosser misrepresentation of truth, and a baser attack on the motives by which Mr. Marshal, now a glorified saint, was influenced in the affair of the union, I seldom have read—"After the examples of their parent society in Scotland, (the writer remarks) Messrs. Marshal and Clarkson having persisted against the union, both drew to another place and claimed the name and the power of the Presbytery they deserted." Whether the party which joined with the Reformed Presbytery in the formation of the union, deserted Messrs. Marsh-

al and Clarkson, or Messrs. Marshal and Clarkson them, is not a matter of much importance. One thing is certain, the former deserted their profession, while the latter clave to it, and whether the name and power of the Presbytery are to be considered as resident in those who deserted their profession, or in those who clave to it, we will leave to the intelligent reader to judge.— Why was not the union formed when the basis of the articles agreed on at Philadelphia by the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, and transmitted by them to the Reformed Presbytery for their consideration, and as the ultimatum of their further proceedings in the proposed union, if not agreed to? Why, they were to plain and unambiguous to afford a cloak under which both parties might shelter themselves, not in union, but in juxtaposition. But the gross fabrication is reiterated again and again, that the protestors against the union, would not and did not make any objection against the articles of the union; “they never attempted to condemn any of them but the last which respects subjection to a foreign judicature.” Now that this is a gross fabrication, will appear from an extract of the minutes of Presbytery, as exhibited in Marshal’s Vindication, pages 28, 29, 30, and also from the reasons of protest given in by the Presbytery, on articles 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6th. Objections were urged and leave craved and granted that those objections should be recorded. These are further stated in the reasons of protest. Marshal’s Vindication of Presbytery. The writer of the Sketches may say, that in them there was no allegation of their being unscriptural. But if an article be expressed in such general terms, that it will admit of a two-fold interpretation, though it might not warrant the charge of being positively unscriptural, yet as an article in a basis of union, it would be in the highest degree objectionable, nay, altogether inadmissible, if unity in the faith, and not in the mere profession of it, is to be the point aimed at. Now this, I think, every impartial examiner of these articles, must admit, is their real character, nor is this to be wondered at, for with such diversity of sentiment, the union could not have been patched up otherwise. The portion of reproach and abuse heaped upon these worthy men, who protested against this most unscriptural union, by the promoters of it, was large and long continued. They were denounced not only in the virulent pamphlet entitled the *Elder*, teeming with all the rancour of disappointed ambition, but in their judicial acts as schismatics, and the faithful of their flocks warned against countenancing their ministrations; and this writer who swells with such indignation as the conduct of the Anti-burghers, for inflicting censure on the



Burghers, with unblushing effrontery holds up to the admiring notice of his union brethren the scandalous sentence passed by the Associate Reformed Presbytery, denouncing these worthy men as schismatics.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

[To be continued.]

## Selections.

### AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST ARMINIANISM.

[Continued from page 125.]

#### THE SECOND POINT TO BE CONFUTED.

##### *Universal Redemption.*

UNIVERSAL redemption, or, *That Christ died for all men*, can not be a gospel truth, because of the following arguments and reasons.

1. God the Father's *election*, God the Son's *redemption*, and, God the Holy Ghost's *sanctification*, must all be of *equal extent* and latitude; but Universal Redemption, in the *Arminian* sense thereof, makes these *unequal*.

This is *clear*; for as the Father, Word, and Spirit are *one in essence*; so are they *one in willing, working, and witnessing*, the redemption of sinners. As there are *three* that bear witness on *earth*, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; so there are *three* which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and *these three agree in one*. 1 John v. 6—8. Whom the Father *elects*, the Son *redeems*, and the Holy Ghost *sanctifies*. If then there be an universal *redemption*, there must be an universal *election*, and an universal *sanctification* also; and so (by consequence) an UNIVERSAL SALVATION. That the Son *redeems* no more than the Father *elects*, is evident from *two* scriptures, the first is John v. 23, which declares the Son must be honoured as equal with the Father; but to say that the son redeemed all, and the Father elected but *few*, is to give greater honor to the *one*, than the *other*, and to make an inequality in their operations. The *second* scripture is John xvii. 9, 10. *All thine are mine, and all mine are thine, &c.* They were the Father's by *electing love*, and they became the Son's by *gift and redemption*; *thine they were and thou gavest them me.* ver. 6. Christ redeems only those whom the Father gave unto him. Hence God's book of life, wherein the number of the elect is recorded, is called also the *Lamb's book of life*; intimating that the number of those elected by the Father, is commensurate with those redeemed by the Son. And that Christ redeems no greater number than the

Spirit sanctifies, is evident from 1 John v. 6. 7, there must be *water* to sanctify, where there is *blood* to redeem: Christ's *oblation* is not of larger extent than the Spirit's *operation*. All the three persons in the trinity have one *object* and one *design of love*: They are equal in essence, equal in honour, and equal in operation.

2. The benefits of Christ's *death* and *resurrection* are of equal extent in their objects ; but the benefit of Christ's resurrection is *not extended to all*.

That the benefit of Christ's resurrection is not extended to all, and every one alike, but is peculiar to believers, is acknowledged *even by the Arminians*. That the death and resurrection of Christ are of equal extent in their objects, is evident from Rom. viii. 34. they are both put together, *who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect for whom Christ died?* Who can condemn those for whom Christ was raised? Those whom Christ died and rose again for, cannot be condemned. *He died for our sins, and was raised again for our justification*. Rom. iv. 25. Those that have the fruit of Christ's *battle*, have the fruit of his *victory* also ; but, this cannot be said of *all men*, for on some the wrath of God abideth. John iii. 36.

3. The benefit of Christ's *death* and *intercession* are of equal extent in their objects ; and Christ intercedeth not for *all*.

This is expressly declared in scripture, *I pray for them : I pray not for the world but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine. They are not of the world*, John xvii. 9. 16. Christ's intercession is not for the *world* at large, but only for those whom his Father hath given to him ; and *reason* confirms this, for if Christ interceded for *Judas, Pilate, &c.* then had he a *repulse*, and was not always heard of the Father, contrary to John xi. 42. Again, Christ is an high priest, and the two parts of his priestly office, *oblation* and *presentation*, cannot be *separated*; and they which have a part in the *former*, have part in the *latter* also. For presentation doth necessarily imply the oblation ; and gives a perpetual force thereto in the sight of God. Heb. ix. 12. Christ must intercede on the behalf of those whom he hath reconciled to God by his death ; and his intercession is a personal presenting of himself and his *five wounds* to his Father, on the behalf of those whom he personated on the Cross. The high-priest of *Israel* in slaying the sacrifice put not the sins of the *Gentiles* upon the head of the beast, but the sins of *Israel only*; and in his going into the *holy of holies*, he did not represent the *Gentiles* before God, but the twelve tribes of *Israel written upon his breast-plate*. So Jesus is a *priest*, in his *oblation* and *presen-*

tation or intercession for those *only* to whom he is a prophet to teach, and over whom he is a king to rule. So that we cannot say there be some men for whom Christ offered himself upon earth, but doth not intercede for in heaven; this would make him but a *half* priest to *some*, and therefore not a *faithful* high priest, contrary to sundry scriptures, Isa. liii. 11, 12. 1 John ii. 1, 2. Heb. ix. 11, 12. and x. 19—21.

4. Those for whom Christ died, have Christ for their surety; but *all* have not Christ for a surety.

All are sinners; and every sinner must die, either in himself, or his surety, for the wages of sin is *death*. And the suretiship of Christ consists in this, that he *died* for us, Rom. v. 8. He was made a curse for us, that is, in our stead, Gal. iii. 13. 2 Cor. v. 21. Judah was a surety for Benjamin's safety, Gen. xlv. 32, and Christ is the surety of the new covenant, Heb. vii. 22, taking upon him our sins in his death, Isa. liii. 4—8. 1 Pet. ii. 24. If Christ was a surety for all, then he offered up a satisfaction for all, in becoming sin and bearing the curse and wrath of God in their stead. But this is not done for all; for Christ knows not workers of iniquity, and *he never knew them*. Matt. vii. 23, yet he knows his sheep, and he laid down his life for them. John x. 11—15.

5. If the covenant of grace be not to all, then Christ died not for all.

Christ's blood is called the blood of *the covenant*, Heb. ix. 20, and the blood of *the new testament*, Matt. xxvi. 28. That the covenant of grace is not extended to *all*, is evident, for it is made with the house of Israel only; *This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people*, Jer. xxxi. 33. The covenant is with those only in whose hearts the conditions are effectually wrought, to wit, putting God's *fear* therein, and writing his law in their *minds*; which the election only obtains.—None dare say, that God entered into a covenant of grace with the seed of the *serpent*, but only with those whose heel the serpent hurteth, Gen. iii. 15.

6. If Christ died for his *sheep*, his *friends*, and his *church* only; then he died not for all.

This is plain from several Scriptures. *I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. I know my sheep, and am known of mine, and, I lay down my life for my sheep*. John x. 11—15. *Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends*, John xv. 13.—

*Feed the church, which he hath purchased with his own blood, Acts xx. 28. Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, Eph. v. 25. Christ died for such as were Paul and Titus, not such as were Pharaoh and Judas, who were goats and not sheep, Matt. xxv. 33. He died to save his people from their sins, and therefore his name was called Jesus, Mat. i. 21. who are called the redeemed of the Lord, Psal. cvii. 2. Now seeing those for whom Christ died are such as hear his voice, and follow him, to whom he gives eternal life, John x. 27, 28. such as he sanctifies, and cleanses, and presents to himself without spot or wrinkle, Eph. v. 27, such as he hath redeemed from all iniquity, to purify them to himself a peculiar people, Titus ii. 14. such as are his people, his chosen, his children, &c. It cannot be intended for all, unless we say that Pharaoh, Judas, &c. were of the sheep, friends, and church of Christ. It is true he died for enemies, Rom. v. 10. but it was to reconcile them to God; such were the believing Romans, who being Gentiles, Christ called "other sheep," not of the Jewish fold.*

7. Those for whom Christ's death was intended, to them it must be applied; but it is not applied to all, therefore it was not intended for all.

The end cannot be severed from the action; Christ's aim being to bestow what he obtains, he obtains nothing but what he applies. He himself speaks of some from whom the gospel was hid; and of others to whom it was revealed, or made known. *Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes, Matt. xi. 25.* The sum total of the intercession of Christ, is, that what he has obtained, may be applied, see John xvii. throughout.

8. If Christ died for all, then must all be reconciled to God; but all are not reconciled.

Sin hinders reconciliation, and Christ's death is a propitiation for sin, Rom. iii. 25, so that, *all for whom Christ died, must be reconciled to God*; the death of Christ is the cause, and reconciliation the effect following the cause. If all be reconciled, all must be saved, and nothing can be laid to the charge of any. Take away the sin, and you acquit the sinner. But to grant such an acquittance and reconciliation to all, brings in many absurdities: For upon this hypothesis it follows,—1st. That Cain, Pharaoh, &c. were reconciled to God by Christ's death, when they were (at the time of Christ's dying) in the torments of hell. 2d. That God damns reconciled persons. 3d. That God takes double pay for one fault, in punishing both the surety and the debtor. 4th. That Christ's reconciling of some is ineffectual, &c. But these



things are *not* so; for to those for whom Christ died, *repentance* is granted, and *remission of sins*. Acts v. 31, to *them* is given freedom from the slavery of sin, and regeneration to newness of life, Rom. vi. 6. Heb. ii. 14, 15, on *them* is bestowed *purifying grace*, *purifying their hearts by faith*, Acts xv. 9. *they* have the blood of Christ to purge their conscience from dead works, that they may serve the living God, Heb. ix. 14, and *their's* is life eternal: *I give to them eternal life, and they shall never perish*, John x. 28. All these fruits are evidences of our reconciliation by Christ's death.

9. That cannot be a truth, which the scripture no where affirms; and it no where asserts that Christ died for all men, much less for every man *individually*; therefore it is not a truth.

It is true, Christ is said to *give his life a ransom for all*; but not for all men, or for every man *individually*: The scripture is the best expounder of itself, and that ALL is rendered MANY in Matt. xx. 28, and Mark x. 45. *The Son of man came, to give his life a ransom for MANY*. My blood—is shed for MANY, for the remission of sins, Matt. xxvi. 28; and it is so frequently restrained to his sheep, friends, church, believers, chosen, and such as are given to Christ, that it must mean, *some of all sorts*; which in *equivalent terms* is clearly expressed in Rev. v. 9, 10. *Thou hast redeemed us OUT OF every kindred and tongue and people and nation*. Therefore, the word, ALL, must be taken for *all the elect, all his church, all his children that the Father hath given him, &c.* not all men universally, and every man *individually*.

10. That which opposes the attributes of God, ought not to be received; and universal redemption doth so.

1st. It opposes his *Justice*: If Christ redeemed Pharaoh and Judas, then redeemed and reconciled souls are unjustly damned; this sets the death of Christ in direct opposition to God's justice. And how could Christ die for Judas' sin, *when Christ's death was his very sin*.

2d. It opposes his *Wisdom*: As if God should love and hate the same person at the same time; Esau must be *loved*, if Christ is given to die for him, yet *hated* as being ordained to death from all eternity.

3d. It opposes his *power*: If Christ died intentionally (as to God) for all, then God's intentions are frustrated, seeing all are not *saved*. Then God is not *Omnipotent*, if crossed in his designs by the work of his own hands. And to say THAT FREEDOM WAS OBTAINED BY CHRIST'S DEATH, FOR THOSE WHO ARE NOT SET FREE, IS RIDICULOUS, AND MAKING A LAUGHING-STOCK OF RELIGION.

### INTELLIGENCE, VIRTUE AND SAFETY.

*We must provide for the formation of a virtuous and intelligent people, or a people capable of self-government.*—The neglect of such a provision, is the capital error of all the old systems. A people capable of self-government, has always been regarded as a chimera; and hence the means which were necessary to make them and to keep them so, have been about the least part of a nation's concern. By an *intelligent* people, we do not mean scholars, artists, naturalists, or politicians. *They* can thrive as well in the regions of mental servitude. Commit your freedom to men of whom *this* is the principal distinction, and they will sell it for a post of honour, for a bag of gold, or for a meal of victuals. We do not want that superior order of worms, whose business is to compute the dimensions of the stars, analyse the qualities of matter, or discuss the mysteries of finance. These are but the lesser actions of intelligence, the recreations of Mind, or at best, a useful drudgery to which it sometimes condescends; they are not its high and natural avocation; they exercise only the lighter and the lower faculties; they are not of the nature of wisdom. We want that superior order of MEN, let them wear the gown of the professor or the apron of the mechanic, who contemplate truth in the light of *immortality*; whose understandings are subject to the dictates of *responsibility*; whose principal study is that of *moral* relations, and whose lives are a system of *moral action*. These are the men, who, placed in any circumstances will adorn their nature, and serve their species. These are the useful members of society, civil, domestic, and religious; equally fit for the blessings of a temporal economy, and the rewards of a heavenly crown. These are the *virtuous and intelligent people*, who must govern our nation, if we would make our nation the strongest, the happiest, and the most perpetual.—Rev. Wm. James' *Serm.* July 4th.



### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Our new correspondent "*Amicus Veritatis*" is cordially welcomed to our pages; he writes well, and we hope he will continue to keep his eye on the Cadiz publication. It is a melancholy fact, that the Associate church cannot hold fast that which she has—that which she knows to be scriptural, without EARNEST contending: for the moment she ceases to contend the enemy will rob her. She is contending for a cause every where spoken against; and yet, who *convinces* her of holding error?—*Nay*, who *charges* her with it? Not one out of a hundred of her enemies, who make the least pretensions to Christianity. Many

there are, in more than one denomination of professing Christians, whose *consciences* do homage to the principles of the Associate church; but ah! she minds non-essentials—she requires family worship of her members—which is not always convenient—she requires parents themselves to give their children religious instruction, when they might save all that trouble by sending them to the Sabbath school—her *discipline* is too rigid.—she still persists in singing obsolete tunes to the antiquated and cursing Psalms of scripture, so as to exclude any thing like improvement, or taste, or elegance in her Psalmody—and we see no necessity for so much *strictness*. Hence they have more charity for your *liberal* Christians, even though they teach, or hold communion with such as do teach, the most destructive heresies. And we know of some ministers and editors who carefully avoid letting their people know there is such a body of Christians in existence, as the Associate Synod of North America, lest some of them should be troubled with her *strict* notions. Does not this prove conclusively that the time has come, in an eminent degree, that men will not only not endure sound doctrine, but that they will not submit themselves to the Lord Jesus as king of Zion, nor be governed by his laws?

We live in a day, depend upon it, of religious *fiction*, *ignorance*, *hypocrisy*, *knavery*, and *apostacy*: And these assertions can be proved by the most unquestionable testimony: we will mention a few things which we know to be facts.

That we live in a day of religious *fiction*, needs no further proof than a simple reference to many of the childrens books taught in Sabbath schools—containing stories worthy of a place with Robinson Crusoe, and Baron Munchausen, and yet this is called *religious* instruction!—and to the numerous accounts of revivals, in Maine or New-Hampshire, published in a Georgia or South Carolina paper—and of revivals in Indiana, Kentucky, or Ohio, published in Massachusetts, or Connecticut papers—or perhaps of a revival in the vicinity of Albany, published in a Philadelphia paper, that *every adult person in a whole town is converted!*—or perhaps you will hear of wonderful reformatations beyond the Atlantic ocean; but be that as it may, we find the following in the London Missionary Register, for June:

“ *Great increase of piety in the United States.*—During the last two or three years, the Spirit of God has been poured upon the inhabitants of the United States, in a manner never before witnessed. Never had we before an opportunity of perusing in the Public Journals such long lists of places, enjoying similar times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. From north to

south, from east to west—in our villages, our towns, and our cities—one voice was heard : it was the voice of weeping ; but of weeping, because they had sinned : it was the voice of joy, because Christ died for sinners. The religious awakenings were attended with seriousness, an earnest desire to attend the ordinances of divine worship, and a total abandonment of worldly amusements.”

Now, we ask for evidence to support this statement, and if any of our correspondents have such evidence in their possession, we should gladly receive it. It is in this way a feverish excitement is kept up in the public mind, which supplies the place of close and prayerful examination of the Bible,—and thus the majority of the Christian world bid every heretical teacher, that traverses the country, “God speed;” for he cannot be wrong whose labours are so greatly blessed.

Again: if any evil is to be corrected; such for instance as Intemperance, or Sabbath-breaking, a flaming zealot, fresh from the Hopkinsian, if not Socinian, manufactories of Andover or Harvard, (who can tell you with all the accuracy of mathematical demonstration, how many souls have been born during the preceding year—how many dollars and cents it will take to evangelize the Heathen world—and how long it would take to pay the national debt, if all the money expended for ardent spirits were appropriated for that purpose,) comes along—calls a meeting—makes a speech, containing a mixture of truth and falsehood—so that, if his subject be Intemperance, you would think there was not a single sober man in the United States, excepting such as had been made so by the temperance societies—and if it be Sabbath-breaking, you would think no man observed the Sabbath, who had not become a member of some of the societies for the better observance of that day.—He then pulls out a constitution ready cut and dried on the New-England model—forms a society, which passes a set of resolutions—publishes them in the newspapers—and lo, the great work is accomplished! Though no one heeds such resolutions, much less thinks of putting them into practice; and they are soon forgotten by the very persons who passed them. Is not this, also, *religious fiction*?

Now all these things are gone about on the supposed infallible efficacy of human means—on the principle that he that planteth and he that watereth is every thing. Does not this prove a great degree of religious *ignorance*? If not, we can inform the reader, the truth of which, if he be an intelligent man, he will have perceived, that we know of many who have professed adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith, and who, nevertheless,



can hear as rank an Arminian as was ever John Wesley, and call it sound doctrine ! So true is this, and so true is it, that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church is going back in apostacy, (and for which some, at least, of our Associate Reformed brethren seem to have great partiality,) that the Christian Advocate and Journal, a paper published in the city of New-York, under the patronage of the Methodist Episcopal church, declares the proximity of that body to be so near its own, as to justify it in claiming a triumph for Methodist principles. The Journal says, that on the subject of lay preaching, and the right of women to pray and exhort in public assemblies, there is no longer any great difference between them and the Presbyterians. And so well founded is this claim, that if the General Assembly should continue for twenty or thirty years to come, to approximate the Methodists in the same ratio that she has done for the last twenty or thirty years, she will be unable to give a single scriptural argument for maintaining a separate constitution from them.—She *already* holds communion with them.

We have said that we live in a day of *religious hypocrisy* and *knavery*. We might prove this assertion by many known facts; but shall content ourselves by referring to the exposition of the conduct of the British and foreign Bible Society, (published in our 4th volume, page 410,) by the Rev. Andrew Thomson, D. D. and by a simple statement of facts which have recently come under our own observation, which are as follows: Early in the spring a meeting of the friends of the Sabbath was called in this city for the purpose of adopting measures, in concert with other meetings which had been called in different parts of the country, for the better observance of the Sabbath. This meeting we attended, encouraged by the hope that something would be done to check, at least in some measure, the awful profanation of the holy Sabbath. But in this we were disappointed; for although these meetings have succeeded in establishing a line of stages between this city and Buffalo, which do not run on that day; and although many individuals signed an obligation that they would not countenance any who violated the Sabbath, but would give the preference to such steamboats and stages as do not violate that day; yet many individuals engaged in this business, then held, and still hold, stock in steam-boats and other craft on the Hudson river, which run as regularly on the Sabbath as on any other day. At one of these meetings a proposition was made that it be recommended to the different sessions, consistories, vestries, &c. to institute an enquiry for ascertaining how many of their members were engaged in violating the Sabbath, by holding stock in steam-boats, that run on that

day; but was voted down! This measure could not be adopted because some officers as well as private members were involved in the guilt of Sabbath-breaking—and would not submit to discipline: Consequently, such a measure would thin the ranks of professors.

Again: About a year since a daily paper was issued in the city of New-York under the title of "*The New-York Journal of Commerce*," claiming the patronage of the Christian public on the ground that it would keep inviolate the holy Sabbath—and that their hands should not be employed in printing it, nor the editor in collecting news for it on that day, as was the case with the other daily papers in that city: But we have unquestionable authority for saying, that this pledge was not kept but one single Sabbath: And to add to the guilt of those concerned, much equivocation and evasion has been used, amounting almost to positive falsehood, in order to blind the eyes of the public.—Among others, the following expedient was adopted; viz: Jews, and seventh-day baptists were employed on the Sabbath! "How are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon!" Are not *these* cases of religious hypocrisy and knavery? Are not such a people ripe for the judgments of heaven?

That we live in a day of religious apostacy, who, that has any discernment of the signs of the times, can doubt? Where are the churches of the Reformation? Where the churches of Holland, Switzerland, Germany, and even of Great Britain? Some are sunk in awful apostacy—others but a few removes from them. Indeed, we can scarcely conceive of moral desolation, more complete, than that which reigns over many lands where once the cause of God and the souls of men was high and flourishing and glorious. In Germany, deism and *professed* atheism, have long reigned triumphant. And if we turn to our own land, the view is scarcely less painful. Here, in a land of bibles and churches, but few comparatively even in the judgment of charity can be considered the people of God. And these few are endeavouring to banish from the earth a reformation cause. The following extract will show something of the spirit against which the friends of a covenanted reformation, will be obliged to contend, if indeed, they should become sufficiently numerous to be thought worthy of attention. It is from the *Philadelphian*, a Presbyterian paper, of July 4th, 1828.

"*Associate Synod of North America.* The minutes of the meeting of the Associate Synod, held in this city in May last, appear in the last *Religious Monitor*, together with the reports of the various Presbyteries under their care, and of the Missionaries to Missou-

ri. We have read them with very little interest. They show the maintenance of *standards* and *doctrinal* opinions, more than the cheering progress of vital godliness."

We had thought the above unworthy of notice; but bring it in here, to show how *apostacy* can become impudent and arrogate to itself exclusive "godliness." The contemptuous manner in which "standards" and doctrines are spoken of, is worthy of that church which has progressed so far in apostacy that her standards have become a dead letter, and are only used to deceive the unwary.

But, reader, if we live, as has been asserted, in a day of uncommon *fiction*, *ignorance*, *hypocrisy*, *knavery*, and *apostacy*; what is our duty? Obviously to HOLD FAST that which we have, that no man take our crown from us. Let us remember that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," and that "evil communications corrupt good manners;" and then let us examine our own hearts with a godly jealousy, lest we may have caught something of this detestable spirit of indifference to the cause of God and truth. No man that is not prepared to make personal sacrifices, and to make an unreserved and unqualified surrender of himself, to the King and Head of the church, submitting all things to him with entire confidence, can expect to be useful to any great extent. The tendency of many of the religious operations of the day is to banish Christianity entirely from our land; and if we give way to the popular current of the day, we shall incur the guilt of abusing privileges the most distinguishing; and we to that people from whom the gospel is taken, that it may be given to another that will bring forth the fruits of righteousness.

The enemy never exhibits all his horrid deformity at first; for he knows how to succeed better. His first approach is generally with a gilded bait, offered directly to the AMBITION of the clergy: His language is, you must surrender some of your most offensive peculiarities, or be contented to suffer reproach, and to spend your days in preaching to a handful of poor despised people, when a more accommodating spirit would gain you access to the rich and the powerful, and besides giving you a respectable living in the world, would greatly enlarge your sphere of usefulness. After digesting this bait for a time, the individual who has received it begins to be less clear on some points of his public profession; and should there be a loose party in the church you will find his vote, in her judicatories, recorded with that party. The next step is, not directly to preach error, but to omit truth; that the minds of the people may become prepared to relinquish it. Next, a neglect of discipline; then a contempt

for creeds and confessions, and the work is done. The church will now increase, and let orthodoxy take care of itself.

But we must close, for when we sat down, we only designed a notice to correspondents, but the foregoing thoughts have forced themselves upon our mind.

We have received an exposition of the 2d Psalm, which is under consideration, and will probably appear in our next.

### PROFESSOR DUGALD STEWART,

Of Edinburg, died on the 11th June, at a friend's house in London, where he had been on a visit. In speaking of his decease, the Edinburgh Evening Post says; "Professor Stewart may be regarded as among the last in that splendid constellation of names which adorned the last century, and which have shed an imperishable glory on the literature of Scotland. The successor of MacLaurin and Ferguson—the companion of Smith and of Burns—the colleague of Robertson and Gregory, and Playfair—he has, like them distinguished himself in his peculiar department of letters. Mr Stewart may be regarded as having completed and adorned by his chaste and elegant style, the structure of modern Ethicks, which Reid before him had shaped out, or rather created, from the rubbish of preceding systems."

How many obscure, humble men are there, "unknown to fame," who have done more for the best interests of the human race than the above "splendid constellation of names?" Perhaps thousands. Ed. Mon.

### MASONIC TRIALS.

THE trial of Eli Bruce and others, for a conspiracy to kidnapp William Morgan, has just come to hand, but too late for insertion in our present Number. We shall give a report of the trial in our next, and in the mean time lay before our readers the following observations respecting it

*From the Anti-Masonic Enquirer of August 26.*

We have been called to witness another exhibition of the corrupting influence of Free Masonry. The trials at Canandaigua, last week, unfolded scenes from which humanity turns sickened and revolting. Almost two years ago a free citizen was taken violently from the protection of the laws, carried one hundred and fifty miles, confined in a magazine, and there deliberately murdered. This was done by a "secret society" to vindicate its "secret laws."—Hundreds of its members were actors in the conspiracy—thousands of them are now engaged in protecting their "mystic brethren" from the laws of the country. This institution has steadily opposed its wealth and power to investigation, and has almost entirely arrested the course of Justice. Until this trial, the utmost vigilance of the people and the laws has never been able to prove that Morgan was confined in Fort Niagara. Although six relays of horses were obtained, and from thirty to forty persons engaged in passing their victim through the country, only one offender has, in two years, been convicted! When every expedient to produce delay is exhausted, the institution requires its deluded votaries to avert the sword of Justice by DELIBERATE PERJURY. Those who have seen free masons writhe through this solemn ordeal, must ever look upon the institution with abhorrence. It caused a moral shudder to run through the vast crowd assembled in the Court House.

To the decision of the Court excluding Mr. Giddins as a witness, we have not a word to object. While we lament that the laws should be so often perverted to protect free masonry, we do not desire to see the unlawful weight of a feather thrown into the opposite scales. We know Mr. Giddins to be a strictly conscientious man—we know that he would have told "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." We know his relation, independent of his own testimony, to be literally true. But his disbelief of the christian religion was proven, and the laws of the land excluded his testimony. It ought to be known, however, that every witness against him were zealots in masonry—men whose manner indicated that they were most happy in visiting the "vengeance," of the institution upon on who had violated its obligations. The



first witness against him committed rank perjury, of which he stood self convicted before he left the stand. The second confessed that he came voluntarily, from Canada, to impeach Giddins, because his testimony would implicate his (the witness's) kinsman, M'Bride. And the other swore a most improbable tale. We therefore leave it for the public to judge with how much allowance such testimony should be received.

The rejection of Mr. Giddins left the prosecution without any testimony against Turner and Darrow. And here it may be proper to explain how far, and in what manner those gentlemen were implicated. It is already known that the whole Fraternity of the west were in commotion about Morgan's book. Three or four independent conspiracies were formed to accomplish its suppression. One at Buffalo, one at Canandaigua, one at Rochester, and still another at Lockport. That at Lockport contemplated that Morgan should be seized and brought directly to that place. In anticipation of his arrival, sheriff Bruce had lifted up a dungeon in the county jail for the masonic offender! To prevent this rash act, as the friends of Bruce, Turner and Darrow undertook to find some other place of confinement. Failing to make satisfactory arrangements in Canada, where they first went, they returned to Col. King, who, with Mr. Giddins, suggested and prepared, "*duly and truly*," the magazine in Fort Niagara.

Among the many evidences of masonic perfidy, none is more glaring than the attempt to corrupt Corydon Fox, by drawing him into the Lodge the day after he carried Morgan to the Fort. With what abandoned confidence did they undertake to destroy the integrity of this witness! The infamous fact that the Lewiston Lodge, assembled at noon-day, to seal, by their blasphemous oaths, the lips of an honest man against the laws of his country, ought to be proclaimed in the ears of every citizen of this union.

If there is a man in this whole community who doubts, or who pretends to doubt, that Morgan was carried from Canandaigua to Fort Niagara, let him be asked why Hubbard, Platt, Wright, Bruce, &c. did not tell *who was in the carriage*. If it was not Morgan, how easy it is for them to prove it? If they were lawfully employed, their innocence could readily be made manifest. But there is not even an attempt made to exculpate themselves. *Not a witness is called to show who was in the carriage, or why it was hurried express to Fort Niagara*. Their whole reliance is on the *mysterious power of Free Masonry!* This sets the laws at defiance and mocks and baffles justice.

We cannot contemplate the overwhelming power of Free Masonry, without trembling for the safety of our country. Free Masonry must be put down or freedom must be banished from her last abode. The government of this country, or an Institution spurning all governments, must come to an end. The people must submit or resist, until their chains are riveted, or their laws vindicated. The hour of trial is at hand. Freemen have every thing to lose—every thing to preserve. Their country, her laws and her institutions, demand action—early and energetic action. The power to do evil must be withdrawn from masonic hands. Her votaries must neither make nor administer the laws of a free people.

### POLLOK THE POET.

The Rev. Robert Pollok was born at Muirhouse, parish of Eaglesham (N. B.) October 19, 1798. His father still occupies the same farm, and is esteemed by his neighbours as a very worthy and intelligent person. Robert was the youngest of the family; and his early days were spent on the farm with his father, in such labours as the seasons called for. He was always fond of reading; and the winter's evenings were employed in this manner, when his companions were perhaps engaged in some trifling amusement. He is not known to have made any attempts at poetry when very young. At seventeen years of age he commenced the study of the Latin language; and a few months after this he produced the first poem which he is known to have committed to paper. In October, 1813, when seventeen years of age, he entered the University of Glasgow where he studied five years: at the end of which time he obtained the degree of Master of Arts. While at college, he was a very diligent and exemplary student, and distinguished himself so far as to have several prizes awarded him by the suffrage of his fellows: besides the regular exercises, he composed a number for his own pleasure and improvement, and several of these were poetical. Before he had finished his *curriculum*, his health

was considerably impaired. In the autumn of 1822 he entered the United Secession Divinity Hall, under the care of Dr. Dick. Here his discourses attracted considerable notice, and called forth some severe criticisms from his fellow students. A mind like his could not submit to the trammels of common division; the form of an essay suited better the impetuosity of his genius; and he occasionally indulged in lofty descriptions, both of character and external nature. In May, 1827, he received license to preach from the United Secession Presbytery of Edinburgh.—During his previous trials he was employed superintending the printing of his poem. His first public discourse is said to have produced a powerful sensation on the audience. The text was, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." Some descriptive parts, respecting those who serve Baal rather than God, are said to have been awfully grand. He preached only three other times, when he was obliged to retire from public service. His labours had been to great for his constitution, in which the seeds of consumption had long before been sown. By some medical gentlemen of eminence in Edinburgh, he was advised to try the effects of a warmer climate.—Italy was his intended retreat; and after providing himself with letters of introduction to some learned men on the Continent, he set out accompanied by a sister. He had got as far as the neighbourhood of Southampton, when, overpowered with the fatigues of travelling, he was compelled to desist. He here fevered, and after a few days expired, far from the scenes of his birth and his studies. It is comforting to learn that Mr. Pollok's death was that of a true saint; his last moments being characterized by patience, resignation and faith.

Mr. Pollok's mind was certainly of a very superior order; of this, there need no other proof be given than the encomiums which his "Course of Time" has called forth—encomiums, many of them penned before his death was known, but which did not appear till after he had gone beyond the reach of earthly applause. His habits were those of a close student: his reading was extensive; he could converse on almost every subject; he had great facility in composition; in confirmation of which, he is said to have written nearly a thousand lines weekly of the last four books of the "Course of Time." The poem as a whole, was, however, no hasty performance: it had engaged his attention long. His college acquaintances could perceive that his mind was not wholly devoted to the business of the classes; he was constantly writing or reading on other subjects. Having his time wholly to himself, he amassed a prodigious store of ideas. It was his custom to commit to the flames every now and then, a great number of papers. He had projected a prose work of some magnitude—a review of Literature in all ages—designed to show that literature must stand or fall in proportion as it harmonizes with Scripture Revelation. But death has put an end to this, as to man's other projects; and all we can now look for is a posthumous volume, for which we are glad to understand there are ample materials in the poems, essays, and sermons found among his papers.—Such a volume, with a memoir of the lamented youth prefixed, cannot fail to prove an acceptable offering to the public; and we hope soon to hear that it is in the course of preparation.—*Religious Magazine.*

---

*From the New-Haven Religious Intelligencer of August 30.*

#### MR. ASHMUN.

Died in this city on Tuesday morning, the 26th inst. J. Ashmun, Esq. late Agent of the American Colony at Liberia, in Africa, aged 34 years.

Mr. Ashmun arrived in this city about a fortnight before his death, via the West-Indies, labouring under severe bodily infirmities.—He was immediately placed under the care of the best medical skill, and had every attention which sympathy and friendship could render.—For a few days he appeared to be much refreshed and strengthened by the change of climate, and was enabled to ride out several times, and hopes were entertained that he might recover. But his complaints had been of long standing; and his constitution which had endured many hardships and uncommon trials, was so far broken down, that human skill could not renovate it, or friendship shield him from the grave. He had filled up the measure of his days, and was called by a Holy Providence in the midst of his usefulness to give up his account; and it is a source of gratification to his friends, that he was permitted to return to this christian land, where he rests in peace.

We have admired the character of Mr Ashmun, as it has been developed to the world, in his public transactions as the Agent and Governor of the little colony of freemen, planted and fostered by his paternal care on the coast of Africa.

He appears to have been eminently qualified for the station to which the Providence of God had called him. Dignified in his appearance, and graceful in his manners, he was fitted to command. He possessed naturally strong powers of mind, and great energy of character, which seemed to prompt him to noble enterprise, and these qualities were refined by a liberal education and controlled by the fear of God.

Mr. Ashmun was prepared for the Gospel ministry, and sanctified, we trust, by grace, for that holy office. But "Ethiopia stretched out her hands unto God," and his philanthropic heart could not resist the call. He volunteered his life, and the sacrifice was accepted. He arrived on the burning shores of Africa, about the time that the remnant of the colonists, who had survived the deadly damps of Sherbro, had been removed to the more healthy station of Liberia.

He found them feeble, houseless, disheartened, and defenceless; soon after his arrival, the colony which could muster only 28 effective men was attacked by more than 800 armed savages. By his energy and prowess they were driven back, but determined on the extirpation of this little band of Pilgrims, the attack was renewed in a few days with increased numbers and redoubled fury, and again the enemy was repulsed. But we cannot in this brief obituary notice give a history of the Colony. It is enough to state that under the management of this great, this distinguished man, the little feeble band has become a nation in miniature. From a chaos of heterogeneous materials, he has formed a well organised community of more than 1200 freemen. Like the patriarchs of old he has been their captain, their law-giver, judge, priest and governor. They are now enjoying the blessings of freedom, for which he has sacrificed his life; and he is *reaping* the rich reward of his labours, we have no doubt, in heaven.

From the little opportunity we have had with Mr. Ashmun since his arrival in this city, we have formed an exalted opinion of his piety.—He manifested great humility of soul—"I do not know" he remarked, "of any such thing as self-righteousness. I am a great sinner; I can rely only on the righteousness of Christ."—"I have come to this country for no other purpose but to regain my health; I have a great desire to recover, (and I don't know as it is sinful) that I may see my parents and kindred, and be able to go back to Africa. I think I can be more useful there than almost any one else—but God knows what is best." At another time he said, "I think I am almost entirely reconciled to the will of God—I don't know but I am quite." A little before his death he was asked, if he could still rely upon the mercy of God in Christ. He replied, "Yes I do."

His patience and endurance were remarkable. Though rolling and changing with pain, he never complained, or alluded to his sufferings, but would often apologise to those around him for his uneasiness. He was much affected with every little act of kindness and attention without remembering what he had done for others. He had seven times buried the last white man in the Colony, yet when he was coming to this place, he was much depressed. "I had been," said he, "for a long time confined to my cabin with my little African boy, and felt in low spirits. Although I had received much kindness in the West Indies, yet the thought that I must be cast among strangers, where I knew no one, distressed me, and I wept like a child. But to receive so much kindness and attention is quite overcoming."

Mr. Ashmun was much affected and comforted by an unexpected visit from the Rev. Mr. Pettengill, of Salem, his "spiritual father and early instructor," as he called him—"under whose preaching my attention was first called to the subject of religion, and with whom I fitted for college." He was also much affected at meeting Mr. Gurley, the Secretary of the American Colonization Society, who arrived from Washington the day before his death. He appeared to be sensible that his end was near, and gave directions about his worldly concerns, with great composure and precision, till within two hours of his removal to another and a better world. And having finished his work, which was well done, he went gently to sleep upon the bosom of his Saviour.

On Wednesday his funeral was attended by a large concourse of citizens, the Faculty and Members of Yale College, a number of the neighboring Clergy,

and the Governor of the State. His remains were carried to the Centre Church, where an appropriate Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Bacon. The interest of the scene was considerably increased by the arrival of the afflicted mother of the deceased, after the services in the church had commenced. She had hastened from the Shores of Champlain to see her son once more. But she was too late. She could only be permitted to join in the last sad tribute of affection. The solemn procession moved to the place of interment, where the burial service was performed by the Rev. Mr. Croswell, and an eloquent, feeling address delivered by Mr. Gurley, on the spot where a monument will be reared to the memory of this Friend of Africa.

The following notice of Mr. Ashmun's departure from Liberia is from the Colonial journal. It evinces the high estimation of his character and worth at the Colony.

The Colonial Agent, J. Ashmun Esq. went on board the *Doris*, March 26th, 1828, escorted by three companies of the military, and when taking leave, he delivered a short address, which was truly affecting; never, I suppose, were greater tokens of respect shown by any community on taking leave of their head. Nearly the whole (at least two-thirds) of the inhabitants of Monrovia, men, women and children were out on this occasion, and nearly all parted from him with tears, and in my opinion, the hope of his return in a few months alone enabled them to give him up. He is indeed dear to this people, and it will be a joyful day when we are permitted again to see him. He has left a written address, which contains valuable admonitions to Officers, Civil, Military and Religious. The Brig sailed on the 27th. May she have a prosperous voyage.

*Thursday March 27.*

Feeling very sensibly my incompetency to enter upon the duties of my office, without first making all the Officers of the Colony well acquainted with the principle objects which should engage our attention, I invited them to meet at the Agency House on the 27th, at 9 o'clock, which was punctually attended to; and I then read all the instructions left by Mr. Ashmun without reserve, and requested their co-operation. I stated that it would be our first object to put the Jail in complete order, secondly to have our guns and armaments in a proper state, and thirdly to get the new settlers located on their lands, as this was a very important item in my instructions. This explanation will, I think, have a good effect; as by it the effective part of the Colony is put in possession of the most important objects of our present pursuits; and I trust through the blessing of the Great Ruler of events, we shall be able to realize all the expectations of Mr. Ashmun, and render entire satisfaction to the Board of Managers, if they can reconcile themselves to the necessary expenses.

### **Ecclesiastical Chronicle.**

**ORDINATION AND INSTALLATION.**—At Mercersburgh, Pa. August 20, by the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, Mr. F. W. McNaughtan was ordained to the office of the holy ministry and admitted to the pastoral inspection of the united congregations of Mercersburgh and Macconnelstown. Mr. Beveridge not having come up, Mr. Whyte preached from Jude 21. "Keep yourselves in the love of God," &c. Mr. Clarkson offered the ordination prayer and gave the right hand of fellowship, and Mr. Pringle delivered the charge to pastor and people.

At the same time and place, Mr. John Kendall was ordained to the office of the holy ministry with a view to the mission to Missouri.

**PRESBYTERY OF CAMBRIDGE.**—At a *pro re nata* meeting of this Presbytery, at Cambridge on the 10th of July last, Mr. Horatio Thompson was licensed to preach the everlasting gospel, and Mr. William Pringle, a statement of whose case will be found in the minutes of the last meeting of Synod, was unanimously admitted as a preacher in the Associate church, having preached before the Presbytery and having passed a satisfactory examination.